School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1363896

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

From the library
of
Professor Leland H. Carlson

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The Great American Illusion

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The Great American Illusion

By

ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH

BR
525
D5

WILLIAM MORROW & CO.
NEW YORK
1927

COPYRIGHT, 1927, BY
WILLIAM MORROW AND COMPANY, INC.
First Printing, October, 1927

University of Southern California Library

PRINTED IN THE U. S. A. BY
QUINN & BODEN COMPANY, INC.
RAHWAY, N. J.

Religion 261.73 D559I

TO
MY WIFE

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I	A TURNING POINT IN HISTORY . . .	1
II	FORCES MAKING FOR CHANGE . .	14
III	THE ECLIPSE OF PROTESTANTISM . .	26
IV	DARKNESS INSIDE FOUR GREAT CHURCHES	42
V	THE FUNDAMENTALISTS POSSESS THE LAND	63
VI	THE LOST LEADERS	84
VII	THE MENACE OF A STATE CHURCH . .	105
VIII	THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN POLITICS .	122
IX	OUR CONTINUING INTOLERANCE . .	138
X	THEOLOGY, THE MAIN INGREDIENT . .	152
XI	FREEDOM BY CONSENT OF THE MAJORITY	172
XII	A RELIGION FOR LIFE	189

228388

FOREWORD

EVERYBODY is from twenty years to a generation behind, except in the things he has especially studied. It is true of the layman in religion. That is why this book is written.

People go about their own business and know as little of what is occurring in the religious field as they know of the changes in the world of the philosopher. This lack of understanding is serious, because the influence of the teaching and practice of the Church reaches into every life. A man ought to know the facts in order to save himself from the shock of surprise which is bound to come if he is unfamiliar with the issues created by conflicting theories of religion.

To-day there are currents of thought and action in the religious life of this country which are bound to lead to consequences of the first importance; and it is no small obligation of the spiritual leaders of the people to report and interpret the meaning of the main movements

which are bearing us onward for better or worse.

One impression is that the clash of what at bottom are but two kinds of religion is over dogmas. That is not the chief thing at all. The spiritual foundation of every man's life is deeper than the intellect. Pride of opinion and creedal exactitude are rightly kept under, and the first place is given to a simpler and more vital principle that is dearer than life, and without which there can be no true religion or civilization. That principle is liberty.

There is a saying that liberty of itself is nothing. To this it may be replied that all else without liberty is also nothing. Of course liberty has virtue according as it is put to good use. The growth of a soul depends upon the seeking of beauty and truth and goodness in the spirit of freedom. A man may rely upon the authority of another for an opinion in law, in medicine, or in business, to serve his civic rights, his health, or his property; but in these things his spiritual condition is not involved. For his character he must rely upon himself because only what he himself knows and experiences can be of any service to him. He must prove all things. He must have perfect

liberty. To the man who said he believed in being moderately liberal Canon Liddon suggested that it meant as little to him as that a woman should be moderately virtuous.

It is an American trait to be for a thing completely and decisively. Among the churches, one is grateful to say, there are voices speaking not uncertainly in behalf of their own liberation, and they are aware of the deadly deterrent of spiritual progress in the individual and the Nation because of a creed-bound Protestantism. Outworn dogmas to-day have to fight to live.

There has never been such an age of heresy as this age, nor such an age of faith! No spiritual loyalty is greater than that of the fearless seeker and finder of truth, and no spiritual decadence is more deadly and sacrilegious than that which closes its mind and heart and says it knows it all. The times are filled with portents, and something is bound to come to change our destiny.

Because men realize that only by liberty can one find the truth for life, the courageous leaders in Christendom are responsive to all promptings for freedom. The author has written much for the church press and is grate-

ful to many journals in the churches for the use and adaptation of materials in this volume. In particular he thanks the *Churchman,* representing the Episcopalians, *Zion's Herald,* spokesmen of Methodism; the *Reformed Church Messenger,* and the *Christian Leader,* which is Universalism's mouthpiece. Among the newspapers, sincere acknowledgment is made to the *New York World,* with its inestimable influence on the daily journalism of this country, for giving prominent place to an article by the writer on present-day religious conditions. Especially are thanks given to the *Independent* for permission to draw upon a series of four articles by the author which were stimulative of religious discussion in all parts of the United States. Interest in the rebirth of spiritual liberty also expressed itself in the Williamstown Institute of Politics, where the approval of an address on the subject furnished the main incentive to put the ideas spoken there into this permanent form.

In every page it is the aim to keep religion uppermost, for no greater disservice could be performed than merely seeking such freedom as would make the gentle and virtuous life of secondary concern. The hope is that the reader

will find in this book a reasonable breadth of understanding and a background of sound doctrine, with no shadow of fanaticism or taint of intolerence. Instead of confusion, the purpose has been to make for a religion of clarity, and in place of sectarianism, the desire has been to set forth those spiritual elements dominant in all good men who seek a universal religion, full of grace and truth.

The author assumes full accountability for what is written in his book.

A. C. D.

Boston, August 10, 1927.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

I

A TURNING POINT IN HISTORY

IT is still believed that the Government of the United States, under divine authority, guarantees to every man his spiritual freedom. Careful study will persuade one that this is not true. In the first place, the fathers who drafted the religious clauses in the Constitution were not interested in vouchsafing liberty in religion to the citizens. These statesmen were very fearful of a godless government and deeply concerned about their own protection in their several sects. In the second place, religion, like education, has always been one of the most zealously guarded of state rights. And in the third place, you cannot put a guarantee of a man's religious liberty into law, because liberty is spiritual and can only be acquired by spiritual means.

In those early days there was intense division among the denominations, and, much more than we have understood, the safety of

the young republic may be attributed to the policy of mutual tolerance which prevented the mischievous activity and dominance of any sect over the others in politics. The churches attended chiefly to their religious business. But in these one hundred and fifty years there has been a constant diminution of distinctions and differences among the Protestant churches and a corresponding development of dogmatic unity, so that, at last, a great solidarity of the sects has arisen, with like doctrines and also with kindred political purposes, and the effect, as we shall see, has been the virtual establishment of a monarchy in the heart of a democracy.

How curious a twist fundamentalist religion has given to the course of democratic progress! While all the world has been bending forward to the hope of a new era of freedom, Protestantism, the historic custodian, as we fondly supposed, of the spiritual sanctity and independence of the individual, and thus the chief sponsor of the democratic principle in government, has proved recreant, for it has become guilty of betrayal of its Lord Christ's heart and of treason against our precious American institutions.

There is an irony here that is bitter to be borne by the ardent patriot and the intelligent believer. He has heard Protestant excursions and alarums against the Roman Catholics and their pretensions to power over our land. He has been warned of that witty and sinister saying attributed to the papist pamphleteer, Louis Veuillot, at the end of the Empire and the rise of the French Republic, in 1870,—an epigram which was addressed in behalf of his beleaguered church to the new administrators of the State. "Gentlemen," he said, "when you are in power, we claim liberty in the name of your principles; when we are in power, we refuse it to you in the name of our own." The thoughtful person sees a strange, diverted and amazing application of that idea; he sees how Protestants have grown strong because this Republic, in the magnanimity of its power, has trusted and defended them in their free careers, only to find, in the day of success, their unspeakable ingratitude and their liberty-killing legislation violating the soul of the Nation. Verily, when we get power, we are dangerous. Protestantism is mighty and it does prevail. It has brought us to a turning

point in history, if we are willing to make the turn.

To-day we stand in the midst of one of the greatest religious issues in the history of Christendom. If the present crisis were merely a sectarian or partisan dispute, it would be unworthy of serious consideration. But vital religion and the souls of the people are involved, and, indeed, the future of Christianity in America and the world. There is an incompatibility between the pure spirituality of Jesus and the practice of the Protestant churches which amounts to radical opposition. At this hour it is as though two worlds had crashed,—the world of freedom with the world of authority. Every great Protestant church feels the force of the contending ideas within its own pale. Not one of them but has suffered incalculably in all of its proper works on account of the great schism. The nurture of the life of the spirit has been grievously impaired because the major effort is being diverted to contention for unseemly control and power. All the preëminent denominations without exception—we speak that we do know —are houses divided against themselves. The persuasive graces of the leaders are insuffi-

cient against the strife which is leading to an inevitable readjustment, which may be, indeed, a real Reformation. For the one thing about which many eminent and brave churchmen of every Protestant faith are agreed is that freedom from external authority, the release from the binding creedal dogmas, are absolutely imperative not only for a true Christian church but for the religious salvation of the people.

It is sometimes forgotten even by ministers that the business of the churches is religion. Every church is on that account the most sacred institution in the world. Religion is the first thing and the last thing, and without it there is no beginning or ending or meaning to life. One were a curious ignoramus and misanthrope to rail against the Church, or in fact against the sects, for each has its reason for being. A man who has come of an unbroken churchly lineage since 1680, who is able to trace through every one of these nine generations of his family one or more ordained ministers of religion, in a deep sense belongs to and loves all the churches, because at the center of all of them is the quest of the human heart for the Eternal Goodness.

I love the places of God,—the Hebrew syna-

gogue wherein the One Spirit is enshrined by the most beautiful mystical aspirations and ethical idealisms that ever came into the heritage of the race; the Roman Catholic cathedral, before whose altar the devout of an early age gathered strength to their souls and withstood the dreadful assaults of the children of darkness, without which faith we of the West should have no Christianity or any other worthy form of religion to-day; the Protestant church of the sixteenth century which under various names still stands like a rock for the sovereign righteousness which brooks no evil and rewards all virtue; the meeting-house, creation of the early Colonists, with its simple austerity and directness of approach to the Almighty, and its rigorous insistence that not priests, as those above and apart, but the people are the true household of believers; and finally, even the uncomely chapel of the countryside and unfavored city section, because of its very outward unloveliness is the more a moving symbol of the longing and desire of its builders and sustainers for the prize of the high calling of the spiritual life.

If hard sayings are the portion of the churches, in time of great controversy, the

words must be the truth in love. If the charges are severe, they are nevertheless just, and they are said not against religion but for it, and in condemnation of the forces which pervert religion, make the churches a by-word, and harm the souls of the people. Our zeal should be exactly like the inspired ardor of four hundred years ago, when a young monk, a lover of the church, aroused the western world in a ferment which caused the greatest upheaval in the history of Europe. Many voices like his are speaking to-day, in passionate reproach against stationary and deadly ecclesiasticism. They are not enemies of religion, but sincere friends of the church.

One of these voices is typical. Guy Emery Shipler, editor of the *Churchman,* journal of the Episcopalians, says: "The rebellion against external authority is everywhere and increasingly apparent. The breakup of the present alignments behind authority in the churches means inevitably a larger and truer unity." The immediate expectation and the prerequisite of unity is the renunciation of the dogmatic and divisive creeds which have no meaning for this present age. The intelligent people who live in a world of freedom in science, in politics,

in education, are wondering why the Church alone still holds them in darkness and in thrall. Why, they ask, is the Church, of all institutions, different? Why is it afraid of the very freedom which is the mainspring of that progress in civilization which religion is supposed to inspire?

The plain truth is, thousands upon thousands of men and women have gone out of the Church. They take no stock in its obsolete teachings to which they once subscribed in order to become members. After great tribulation, they have made their declaration of religious independence. They have taken the right turn for their own salvation.

Instead of distrusting freedom, which is the state of mind in ninety per cent. of Pan-Protestantism, the churches should be its stoutest defenders, its omnipotent advocates. But they have never done their avowed duty. The relation of religion to our democracy will illustrate our meaning. From the beginning there is a curious and significant mingling of influences good and evil, as we shall see, which are gathered up in the present unprecedented conflict. Fortunately, there have always been prophetic voices in American religious life, and

President Coolidge stirred the imagination when he said in Philadelphia, July 4, 1926, at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, that the colonial preachers were the men who first gave us that heaven-born instrument and the Constitution of the United States. Without freedom in religion we should not have had freedom in our State. Then men were "young for liberty," and they fought valiantly against all intolerant and dogmatic requirements which in our day under the compelling leadership of the churches, are being forced upon and through one Legislature and School Board after another.

The thought of a state church, which we have, virtually, in such commonwealths as Tennessee and Mississippi, with others threatened, was most abhorrent to the chief founders. Thomas Jefferson said in the Virginia House of Delegates, that "'whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free," all attempts to influence it "by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of meanness and are a departure from the Holy Author of our religion, who being Lord of both body and mind, yet

chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as it was in His almighty power to do." That sentiment was written into the law of his State and into the soul of the Nation.

With naïve credulity, we Americans have always thought that this liberty was a fixed reality, a fiat from heaven, never to be touched. As a matter of fact, in many parts this great possession has been almost completely taken away from us. And the tragedy is, no one in official place in any of the creedal Protestant churches,—and they are more than nine-tenths of Protestantism,—is doing anything to save us! The "punishments," "coercions" and "meanness" against the possibility of which Jefferson inveighed, are all about us, as every alert churchman knows, as he also knows that the prevailing powers in Protestantism do not believe in religious freedom.

Here let one make a footnote. This last statement does not mean that there are not friends of freedom in the churches. There are many such. But not a single official declaration for freedom by any creedal Protestant Church has been made throughout the epochal struggle since 1922. More, there is not a word of change in the doctrinal standards of any

of these communions, not a belief which rises above the theology of Calvin of the sixteenth century, and, in respect of church authority, not one of them admits of more latitude than Augustine did in the fifth century. Things are as they were.

It is not enough that winking allowances are made by cautious parsons in both doctrine and administration to win church members. The churches will not be honest and blameless until they make a new law and live by it, instead of saying one thing and believing another, as President W. H. P. Faunce remarked of his own Baptist communion.

Every week it is my duty to read sixty representative American and English church journals. They speak for their denominations in an authoritative way. I say deliberately and with an accurate knowledge of the facts, that with the exception of not more than six of this number, liberty is never mentioned. It is, indeed, a word tabooed. In the country's history of religion we have not had such ominous and cowardly silence as we suffer on the very central teaching of Jesus and the fundamental principle of our country.

Church editors and other dominant ecclesi-

astical leaders depreciate and even deprecate liberty, and yet every church called Protestant is supposed to be chartered in liberty. Even the wayfaring man who is not a fool knows there is not a great churchman in official station to-day who speaks for freedom as the major issue of Christendom. Many leaders are eloquent (and it is well) on personal piety, social amelioration, and goodly fellowship, but on the greatest thing, not a word! One might name most of the eminent preachers in America to-day and place them in a catalogue of lost leaders. They will not meet the time's demand. Somehow they have sold their birthright.

One who has followed probably as closely as any churchman the fundamentalist advance over the whole land may well be disheartened and dismayed at the shrinking of the masters of Protestantism from "the battle of the Lord." Yet in this menacing day, with the liberty of the children of God set at naught by the medieval rule of the churches, one looks for a sign. It must appear soon. The galled spirit of thousands of ministers will some day openly revolt, and for their sake and the people's sake a man will arise. Spiritual vitality and intel-

lectual integrity will not be forever dishonored.

In a mood of conscientious objection, Dr. Elwood Worcester, the scholarly Episcopalian rector of Emmanuel Church, Boston, said: "I am tired of longer saying a thing which is not true. The Apostles' Creed says that Christ descended into hell, and it meant exactly what it said when it was written. We do not believe that. It says that he ascended into heaven as a bodily presence, a physical, corporeal being. We do not believe that. It is said that the body, the carnal estate, rose from the grave, and we do not believe that. And we are not only tired of saying that literally, but we are no longer satisfied by privately interpreting it to ourselves and publicly saying the words which are a lie to our people."

He concluded: "To-day a great Spirit is passing over the earth which says, 'I take my stand upon the present and mean to dominate it; and if I destroy the past, it is for the sake of the future.' "

II

FORCES MAKING FOR CHANGE

NEAR the close of his day, Dr. Charles W. Eliot wrote an article on the religious conditions in the United States, in which he defined three kinds of people. There are those who "prefer to live under sacerdotal authority; those who prefer to take their opinions and beliefs from other minds; . . . and those who habitually think for themselves . . . and live in the present and the future rather than in the past."

The people composing the third group find a religious sanction for their independence of thought. It is liberty. Liberty is a vital principle within them which creates the chief force that will save America. Any external authority over a man which denies him perfect freedom cannot endure in a democracy. To-day there is warfare in Protestantism because the ministers and the people in the pews are caught in a system which binds them, if they are true

to their vows, to accept their "opinions and beliefs from other minds." Some of them are kicking against the pricks. The idea of Dr. Eliot is shared wherever men think. That outspoken Anglican, Dr. H. D. A. Major, editor of the *Modern Churchman,* London, almost at the time Dr. Eliot was writing, was saying the same thing in the language of the theologian.

"After you have decided," Dr. Major declared, "whether you will be a Pagan or a Christian, you are left with only three live issues. These are Romanism, Fundamentalism, and Modernism: Romanism—which believes in an infallible church, guided by infallible general councils, governed by infallible pontiffs; Fundamentalism—which believes in an infallible Bible, of which every statement is accurate and must be accepted as true by every Christian; Modernism—which believes in the Spirit of Truth and Love seen in Jesus Christ, and which, in so far as we are loyal to it, will lead us upward and onward along the lines of true moral and spiritual progress."

Each of these eminent contemporaries speaks in his own tongue the inarticulate but nevertheless passionate yearning of increasing numbers of people who want somehow to

break the chains of the churches and be free.

There are enough modernists in Protestantism to lead such a crusade. But will they do it? They are under the rule of an institutional tyranny. In the case of ministers, their livelihood, their good name, their professional career, are all enmeshed in the machine. They could extricate themselves if they were willing to pay the great price. In private they speak their beliefs and attempt to justify themselves to their liberated brethren. But before the altar they still use words that are not sincerity and truth. Sweet are the ways of religious fellowship and loath are men to cause the slightest disharmony by condemning the conduct of their colleagues in any of the churches. But all of us hearken when a man of the kindly wisdom and judicious poise of Dr. Eliot, at the summit of his career, in 1924, renowned at once for his simple religious faith and his embodiment of all that we cherish in America, says plainly that these men who know better "are liable to the suspicion that their laxity as regards creeds, dogmas, and rituals may render them less sincere or candid in speech and practice before God, and even when speaking to God, and quite irrational in their eagerness

for unity." This clear intimation of insincerity and unreasonableness,—that is, the defects of the heart and the mind,—is sensed by great numbers of thoughtful persons, who are fortified in their resolution to join the growing and irresistible forces that will one day bring the great change.

Hear a voice from the crowd. Miss Elisabeth Gilman, daughter of Daniel C. Gilman, the founder of the Johns Hopkins University, is an earnest church member. She declares that she and many others have "found themselves unable to express any sort of literal belief" in any of "the twelve affirmations of the Apostles' Creed." But that belief must be spoken, says the Church. It must be literally accepted. Miss Gilman wants to know if she must get out. "We were encouraged to think that the solemn injunction" laid on the minister at his ordination to " 'teach nothing, as necessary to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture,' was a sufficient charter of his intellectual rights to save him from slavery of organization loyalty as contrasted with loyalty to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ." Miss Gilman discovers

that the pulpit is not free; that the liberty allowed in it is so-called "lawful liberty," meaning liberty "limited by traditional church doctrine and discipline," which, she says, is something "quite other and altogether less large and lovely than the liberty with which Christ made us free." She speaks eloquently for the noble company of elect and brave of every sect—for they are all alike in this—who surround her as she exclaims: "Can you, the Church, suggest how the free laity in the pews are going to maintain even a modicum of intellectual respect for the unfree clergy in the pulpit?"

If the honor of the churches is smirched, what of their intelligence? Here, also, the forces are marshaling against the doctrines that, for youth especially, are preposterously anachronistic. There is unquestionably a revolt of the rising generation, but it is not the godless and blatant thing that flares from the first page of the newspaper. A whole new world of ideas is being born, and the young men and women in intellectual centers take in the new thinking as a part of their daily routine. When they say they do not believe in God, it is shocking. But understand them.

What they mean by God is the conventional theories about ultimate reality. They repudiate beliefs which have lost all meaning for them and their teachers, and insist the reality is greater than any concept about it.

A doctrine of Deity is one thing; the power and phenomena of life, and man's growing apprehensions of his place in the universe, are another thing. The facts are abiding but the thought about them is endlessly changing. If one's views do not grow, one is spiritually dead or dying. The churches as a whole do not know that to-day there is a violent intellectual revolution among all people who think. The so-called theism that is embalmed in the old theology and is still preached is utterly defunct for many persons of this generation. Like it or not, that is the fact. The students, let it be understood, are not Philistines, in this open rebellion. They are normal and typical. Their discerning elders think as they do, and are only less vigorous and vocal about their demand for a better scheme of faith. Prof. George A. Coe has made a scientific analysis of the religious mind of the leaders in college life, and he finds that of the several kinds of American religion, namely, miracle religion,

sentimental mysticism, modernist evangelicalism, and ethical creativity, only the fourth has any lasting reality for the great majority of students who are, of course, coming into the nation's intellectual and spiritual leadership.

What is ethical creativity? It is not a defense of an ancient faith. It is our own experimentation with this present life. This religion "finds God by doing the will of God in unprecedented ways in the spirit of Jesus." That spirit is not an incomprehensible dogma. It is simple Love and Truth, with no sectarian, national, racial, or historical limitation. It is a universal principle, and whoever uses it is religious in the highest sense,—as Charles Cuthbert Hall learned in India,—whether one call oneself Christian or Jew, Buddhist or Mohammedan. Religion is not only or chiefly a contribution from the past but a creative spirit for the present and the future.

Abandonment of the old that is uncouth is at heart not a negative but an affirmative action. Religion thereby becomes original. The portents to-day are all to the good. The time-spirit speaks for progress. Already a completely new organism of theology is in gestation, and the doctrines of our grandparents

are as obsolescent for this generation as the terrible eighteenth-century ideas of God were unacceptable for theirs. Whether or not the movement called humanism will rout theism, we cannot tell, but the old order will pass away,—is, in fact, passing. Once polytheism was vanquished by deism, and deism in turn by theism, and religion gained all the while. Another push in the evolution of man's spiritual history is now upon us. They are to be pitied who do not know it and have no part in it.

The people who recall the brutal theology of Jonathan Edwards that once made millions quaver in terror, will agree with James Truslow Adams, the eminent historian, who said it "blasted the morality of the universe and damned the character of God." William Ellery Channing helped much to destroy that horrendous blight upon the mind of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Someone with inspired audacity, consummate understanding, and prevailing human sympathy will do a like service for our own times. That man is coming, Father Abraham! More glorious will be his day for the race than any that men have seen.

Meanwhile, there are righteously impatient ones who think the fullness of time is unconscionably long in arriving. But it is the nature of religion itself, in part, to hold fast to custom. Unfortunately, they who control the majority of Protestant churches are dominated by this primitive static idea. Religion, they think, must not change. But they do not know that religion has always changed except among people who have remained in darkness. The rise of the race from "the first man Adam to the last man Christ" is an epic of spiritual evolution. From cave to cathedral the ascending soul of humanity has been interested in self-preservation. That is the end of all religion. The difference between one man and another is not in the aspiration of either, but in the meaning each gives to the religious instinct. What is self-preservation? To an aboriginal it is divine protection from hostile natural forces; to a Babbitt it is plenty of "good things" wheedled from a Provider; to Jesus it is perfect oneness with the Overself; and to enlightened men of His spirit it is dedication of oneself in service to the common good of mankind.

Our struggle is not, as it once was, for life

alone, but for the life of others. The fixed customs of the savage Fire Worshipers in Terra del Fuego and the ethical creativity of the American churchmen who abolished the twelve-hour day that was seering and breaking men in the steel industry, represent in a way the gamut of religious advancement. No more is custom in control. We have passed from reliance on "a power not ourselves" to do our work for us, to man's own endeavor, under the divine laws of life, "to sustain and save the soul by fortifying the ongoing love and will." This force increases among the leaders of men, and they will sweep aside any opposition which attempts to stay their onward march.

History speaks its warning to the dogmatic obscurantists, those enemies of the people, always entrenched comfortably in institutional fastness. And history is always repeating itself. Look at the sixteenth century, when religion under Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli achieved a unification of the peoples beyond race and geographical barriers which James Bryce says reached the highest point in history up to that time. A new era was created. Look to the East to-day. Mahatma Gandhi, called

the Indian Christ, after social, economic, and political pleas to his numberless people failed, spoke words like the Sermon on the Mount, immolated himself in abstemiousness, and brought his race to a mighty consciousness of itself through the gospel "of regenerated manhood, of freedom, and of a future spiritual glory for India." Look at the world. Chief inspirer of universal brotherhood is religion; and its vision and passion for the League of Nations as an instrumentality of freedom and human justice (which is love for all and all alike) are still undimmed and unabated. The greatest appeals in history are religious appeals. They produce the responses that change the course of civilizations.

These things we know. And more we know. If religion is potent above all things and gentle as the morning light, if need be it has also the appearance of irresistible and volcanic force. It is hardly true, as Don Marquis has said, that the uncompromising practice of the "doctrines of Jesus would undoubtedly blow all the established systems to flinders," because there is some good in everything; but it is true that on essentials pure religion admits of no compromise. "The moment religion abates, by

one whisper, its intolerant idealism, it ceases to exist; it becomes something else. It cannot make terms or it defeats itself. The human race as it finds itself on this planet must either extirpate it completely or practice it sincerely. . . ."

There are sins of the spirit and mind in the churches that are far worse for the souls of men than all the sins of the flesh. The official dogmatist of the Bible was placed lower in the scale than the grosser wrongdoer; and the judgment was just. When a person, a child of the Eternal, is put in an ecclesiastical prison-house whose walls keep him from the free light of earth and heaven, he is violated, and his masters seem almost beyond the pardoning grace of the Eternal. Only in freedom can one render service and fulfill his life. Under bondage one renders but servitude. The churches must give freedom. Only the bird on the wing can sing in lyric joy.

III

THE ECLIPSE OF PROTESTANTISM

WHEN the foes of religious liberty came marching to battle against the new freedom that was everywhere emerging in this country after the Great War, America awoke to a new phenomenon in the Protestant churches. The old creedal sects, once almost innumerable and sharply divided, were gone. That is, in all matters of belief and in all phases of public action, they were united. To-day these churches make a single spiritual force. All one body they!

But they are not Protestant, as this story will prove. Protestantism is in eclipse. The assertion by Herbert Parrish that the break-up of Protestantism is the outstanding fact in the religion of these times is quite beside the fact. That which wears the Protestant label was never so cohesive and adamant as it is to-day. But it ought to bear another name; in fact, it does.

Those intelligent modern religious leaders who had long gone their own way, were startled when they learned that their churches were in the power of darkness. At first they could not believe it, it was so preposterous and medieval. But they had to acknowledge reality. Nothing daunted, they sallied forth with a superior nonchalance against the foe in their own household. And when they met resistance, these Modernists entered valiantly into the conflict certain that truth, which is mighty, would prevail. They breathed the spirit of the crusaders. Like Ulrich von Hutten, who lived just before the Reformation in the sixteenth century, they felt they were coming into a glorious period of liberation that would endure forever. "O new age!" they seemed to say with him. "Study is flourishing, minds are awakening, it is a joy to live!"

To-day the Modernists in all the denominations have retired. Not a notable figure remains on the field. Their enemies have won the fight on every sector in Christendom. The movement to give us a liberated church has halted and collapsed. As this chapter is written, the great denominational meetings of 1927 are ending. Specific incidents in their

transactions confirm the findings of those who have followed the great controversy from the beginning. Peace, almost perfect peace has pervaded their deliberations. How different, seemingly, it was two years ago. Then the Presbyterian Fundamentalists, for example, overwhelmed the General Assembly at Indianapolis, and by a vote that took away the breath of the more liberal elements, required denominational approval of the five fundamentals. They elected the intransigent Fundamentalist, Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, Moderator, and incontinently ousted the Modernist, Dr. William P. Merrill, from the Board of Foreign Missions. These things were a sign. To be a Presbyterian one must be a Fundamentalist. That is what it meant. The conservative and determined men would stand so much, and then they would show what they could do when they had a mind to. No one who understands disputes their mastery. The same condition prevails in the other creedal churches. A few wishful thinkers believe that the Fundamentalists, because they are no longer fighting, have been defeated and have retreated. The fact is that the Fundamentalists have won everything in the battle

they started. They are happy. Their five points have nowhere been rescinded; these are still the infallible word of the Presbyterian Church. It would be impossible for the Modernists to wipe them from the sorry record. What *is* changed for a season is the temper of the Church. It is weary of strife. But it was the Modernists, not the Fundamentalists, who first raised the flag of truce. The *Christian Century* says, "There is almost an obsession with the idea of peace [in the churches], which makes men willing to do or refrain from doing almost anything in order to avoid trouble." That is the essence of the situation. This journal continues, "The very eagerness to avoid issues . . . is one of the surest ways in the world by which to pile up issues, which, at some later date, will compel more struggle." Things are not settled unless and until they are settled right. Freedom! The soothing strains of love, in bondage, and the stressing of good works are uppermost now, but it is because of "the manifest eagerness to shunt off any topic concerning which there could be any possible difference of opinion." Passing from the Presbyterians, the *Century* says such a mood may be a good thing "for the Baptists in 1927,

as they try to recover from the shellshock of the past eight years, but it foreshadows trouble for the Baptists in 1937. There are issues too big to be forever dodged."

Other considerations enter to protract the truce. Why, for instance, the reconciling disposition these days of Dr. Jasper C. Massee, the first chairman of the Baptist Fundamentalists, and once terrific preacher of "second coming" threatenings and slaughterings? Baptists say Dr. Massee desires to be President of the Northern Baptist Convention. Discretion means peace and votes. As to the works of the churches, division kills them, harmony promotes them.

But if you prick the Protestant churches at any doctrinal point, you will find the strain of Fundamentalism coursing in the body of believers. Dogmatism is peaceable only because it is dominant. A dramatic incident in the 1927 General Assembly, at San Francisco, illustrates the Presbyterian and indeed the Protestant mind. One Elder Huston, of the Chester Presbytery, arose in the Assembly to inquire if the report received from a commission on doctrinal requirements meant that the Presbyterian Church was not clear in its belief

in the Virgin Birth. This dogma is the main cause of the Presbyterian difficulty. The Moderator, Robert E. Speer, an irreconcilable Fundamentalist with a peaceful spirit, arose instantly and replied fervidly, *"We do believe it!"* Then, in a spontaneous outburst, the opening words of the Apostles' Creed leaped to his lips, and by the time he reached the affirmation, "born of the Virgin Mary," *every commissioner in the vast Assembly* was on his feet repeating these words and the rest of the rock of faith. Elder Huston was radiant. He said, "I accept this as the Assembly's unanimous vote for that portion of the Creed."

All that the Assembly did, all that any of the creedal churches have done, is one with this episode. It is not the fact that belief in a given dogma is held by the churches, but the requirement that the Fundamentalist system in all points is inviolable and apparently invincible that comes out of these years. Victory rests with the Fundamentalists.

The dogmas which have been the bane of Protestantism these four hundred years are again triumphant, and the organized religion of Jesus, whose charter is liberty and whose service is perfect freedom, passes into a period

of intolerance not equalled since the Chaos. Protestantism enters a new dark age.

Dogmatism is in control of more than ninety per cent. of the people in the denominations. Only impregnable Rome, adroit, patient, and consistent Rome, can vie with her once scattered and dissenting children who present a mighty, solid front in defense of the very kind of religion they were created to overcome. To-day Protestantism is creed-bound with new fetters of triple brass. Instead of the marvelous promise of spiritual rebirth that one sensed on every side, at the opening of the present decade, we have witnessed the disastrous defeat of freedom. The opportunity for liberation came, but our prophets were found wanting.

In one church after another,—Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and all the others,—the holy warfare has ceased. The Fundamentalists have overwhelmed their liberty-loving brethren. The strife is over and peace prevails. The churches have denied to their ministers by one form of declaration or another (we shall presently cite instances) the freedom of individual conscience, and their laity have meekly acquiesced with only spo-

radic uprisings of the more emboldened ones who have had no real effect upon the triumphant security of the Fundamentalists. Rigor and reprisal are all about the churches. Those astute ecclesiastical masters understood what it would mean, if there should be an uprising against the kind of Christianity that has preserved the dogmatic churches hitherto. The institution would be put in jeopardy. They must save that, at all costs, not even excepting the cost to religion itself and the free souls of the people. The disaster was averted. Though the central teachings of dogmatism these four centuries are "a dislocated and deformed story of the divine order of the world," as James Martineau said, and though the whole scheme is preposterously unreal, "from the fable of Eden to the imagination of the last trumpet," the institutionalist has had his way. It matters nothing to him that every one of the principal doctrines which prevail to-day contains not a single moral and spiritual element which we associate with the religion of Jesus. It is true now as it was a half century ago that "Christianity as defined and understood [and required] in all the churches which formulate it has mainly evolved from what is tran-

sient and perishable in its sources; from what is unhistorical in its traditions, mythological in its preconceptions, and misapprehended in the oracles of its prophets." Ponder the fact—these amazing things have the ascendancy to-day everywhere in Protestantism. For a member or a minister boldly to deny them is to destroy his place in the churches. It is not done. It would be, they say, to betray the spirit and name of the One who, as a matter of fact, never said a single word about the value of any of these abnormal notions from the beginning to the end of his life. He would not recognize them, by any possible vagary of the imagination, as having the least to do with his simple spiritual truths and his puissant moral dynamics.

It is interesting if not edifying for one to learn how such monstrous conceptions came into intolerant dominance. At the time of the Reformation, when the dissenting people began to form themselves into sects, they made the Bible, and not freedom, as some suppose, the test of Protestantism. To defend the Scripture was the major necessity. Thus the Reformed churches set up their Heidelberg Catechism, the Lutherans the Augsburg Con-

fession, the Presbyterians the Westminster Confession, the Church of England, later, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Methodist Episcopalians the Discipline; and all of the other faiths that arose, except the handful of free churches, likewise have their standards which bulwark the master dogma of Bible infallibility.

From the sixteenth century to this day there has not been the slightest departure in principle or in doctrine, and only a little official deviation in Protestant church practice, from the inexorable authority that quickly imposed itself upon the whole Reformation movement. In Europe and America it is all the same. The central proposition of Protestantism in every creedal denomination is as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians, and, whatever freedom the people have, has been won outside the pale. Holy men to-day are broken on the wheel of the ecclesiastical machine as truly as they were in the Middle Ages, though the torture now is all exquisitely mental. The threatening inquisition silences the agonizing bosoms of tens of thousands of repressed and frustrated clergymen. It is hell for them. This is true all over the land, and in the coun-

tries of Europe. In 1926, a minister in the Reformed Church in Holland was cast out by the Synod of Amsterdam because he did not believe that the serpent in the Garden of Eden spoke Hebrew words to Eve, as recorded in Genesis. That was typical. A Nebraskan Methodist Episcopal minister was forced out of his church and the denomination in 1922 because he denied that a good God would drown all the people of the earth except Noah and his family. His brethren dare not repeat his heresy! Such incidents are without number. It is ridiculous, therefore, to speak of the Reformation and of Protestantism.

Set it down now for all time: We never got the Reformation and we have never had Protestantism.

In the creedal churches, which overwhelmingly outnumber the others, liberty is dead.

What the alleged reformers did was to exchange an infallible Pope for an infallible Book. That was merely adopting a new and really inferior dogmatic master, a weaker authority.

The great spiritual liberator and saint of France, Auguste Sabatier, understands. "The Church," he says, "has this advantage over the

Bible: that it is a social organism, alive, contemporaneous, flexible, able to deal with all the new questions, to develop itself skillfully without inconsistency, thanks to the principle of inspiration which it carries within itself."

Protestants have nothing like that.

Further, "The Church can show itself tolerant in all that it cannot prevent, can close its eyes to all that it is best not to see; in short, in ruling the minds of men it can conduct itself with all the freedom, prudence, and patience of governments which are sure time is working for them."

Protestants have no such adaptation, whatever one may say of the ethic of Rome.

Sabatier continues, "The Bible, on the contrary, is a document of the past, a book whose form and ideas are those of a certain date, and respond to a definite degree of culture and state of civilization."

In fine, Protestantism is static, hard. And the wise Frenchman will not have one defend the Bible on the ground that its spirit is a spirit of life.

"The question here," he says, "is not of the Christian spirit, which is indeed independent of the letter of Scripture, but of the letter it-

self, which Protestant orthodoxy holds to be the pure and very Word of God to which it would bind its adherents as to a divine law, the external expression of the truth."

The conclusion is inescapable: "We surely must feel that the system of infallible authority of a book is much less easy to maintain, much more difficult to practice, than that of the infallible authority of a Church."

When we say that Protestant churches are authoritarian, we mean they compel the people to obey the doctrines. The individual Protestant has no more right to his own belief than has the individual Roman Catholic; and the latter, of course, is perfectly consistent with the principle of his church, while the former utterly violates the principle of the individual's sovereignty over his soul.

The dogmas variously required in the Protestant churches are the five points of Fundamentalism: the absolute infallibility and authority of the Bible; the Virgin Birth as the necessary basis for the doctrine of the complete deity of Jesus; the substitutionary atonement, by which God took the life of the Son for the sins of all the people in the world; the resurrection of the same body that was buried;

and the second coming of Jesus in the flesh to rule the world with a rod of iron.

These beliefs are central for the overwhelming majority of the followers of Jesus to-day. These are the inviolable laws of Protestantism. Ask a minister if it is not true.

Now we know why reaction in religion has spread over the whole world. In fact, the only gain of the past five years is that people have learned more truth about organized religion than men knew about it in all the other four hundred years since Luther nailed up his theses. They are shocked to find that religious liberty is the greatest illusion extant in this country.

Having subdued the people and made the creeds of the sixteenth century rule the minds of the twentieth, the churches naturally went on to unite for political action. The Fundamentalists decided to banish liberalism by legislation. Their threat lay in the curious fact that they suddenly achieved a united front. They tasted power and they liked its savor. There had been nothing like it since Protestantism began.

Sectarian differences disappeared. The Fundamentalist might espouse the Baptist,

Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian or any one of a number of faiths,—but first of all he was a Fundamentalist. Armed with the tremendous strength of triumphant solidarity, the Fundamentalists determined to make their religious faith the law of the land. They have marched against one legislature after another. They still march. Seven States are already under their domination. The campaign goes on mightily. A virtual state church composed of the united denominations is a fact. With the rising tide of Fundamentalism the state lawmakers have assumed divine right exactly as the King or Emperor once did as head of the Church. Under such domination both democracy and Protestantism, as we understand and cherish them, disappear.

But all of this astounding and incredible upheaval in both Church and State is not new. The battle between the Fundamentalists and the Modernists did not create, it only disclosed conditions that have always controlled so-called Protestant churches. Luther himself, that volcanic and tumultuous personality, is responsible for almost killing the child of his impassioned soul. When he saw what he had begotten, that is, the emancipated individual,

he was shaken with terror, for he realized the religious, political, and economic consequences of telling people, especially the millions in serfdom, that they were no longer subjects of rulers but children of God, with natural rights of some sort like those of kings and popes. They were bound to arise! In his recoil from his dangerous accomplishment he was abetted by the princes, the prelates, and the conservative leaders of the mart, who knew the revolutionary consequences to the established order of such a Christian doctrine.

Religion then and there reverted to the type and principle from which, under Luther, it had revolted. The Reformation died aborning. The source of freedom for the world was cut off. The momentum of a brief decade of liberated spiritual consciousness gradually spent itself. The dynamic of freedom became an exhausted force in the creedal churches. To-day we witness the inevitable reaction,—the submission to bondage. These churches have gone into almost total eclipse, even in this free country.

IV

DARKNESS INSIDE FOUR GREAT CHURCHES

EVERY historic church has had its martyr age. It has contended against a hostile public opinion, says Samuel M. Crothers, and won its right to live. It has of necessity sided with the party of freedom. But when this necessity of freedom for its own preservation no longer faces the church, it is so human that it rarely resists the temptation to refuse to others the means by which it became strong. It denies freedom, joins the hostile opinion, and makes martyrs. Is this true to-day?

An intimate inquiry into the present condition of four of the principal Protestant churches, which are, indeed, representative of all of them, will disclose verifiable facts that are their own commentary. The Baptists come first because it was in this great communion that the Fundamentalist movement had its origin. Surely these people have had their heroic age. The Baptist likes to remember John Bunyan, who chose, as Dr. Crothers re-

minds us, to remain year after year in Bedford Jail, rather than allow a civil magistrate to dictate where he should go to church or what he should preach. But it is the Baptists, led by men like John Roach Straton, who to-day help to make a law in Tennessee which dictates what shall be taught to the whole people. They hail John Scopes into court and convict him for instructing high-school students on evolution.

The Presbyterian tells his children the story of the fight of the Scottish Covenanters against Bishops and prayer books. To-day Presbyterians drive Harry Emerson Fosdick out of one of their great pulpits because he believes that the ancient Westminster Confession should be no more binding than the unacceptable prayer book.

The Methodist remembers how cheerfully John Wesley went about England defying mobs and overcoming them. The Methodists in our time pursued, harassed, and finally broke the heart of Hinckley G. Mitchell, one of their great and devout scholars who ventured to tell what is now everywhere regarded by teachers as commonplace truth about the Old Testament.

The Episcopalian hallows the names of Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley, who "without Bocardo Gate," opposite Balliol College, Oxford, were burned at the stake. Latimer's last words are quoted with awed voice, "Be of good cheer, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." But the American House of Bishops of the lineage of the Anglican Church, in 1923 at Dallas, Texas, threatened and silenced the clergy, and especially Bishop William Lawrence, who dared to question the literal truth of the Apostles' Creed.

THE BAPTISTS

According to their doughty editor, Dr. Curtis Lee Laws of the *Watchman-Examiner,* the Baptists are eighty-five per cent. Fundamentalist. There is in this church a minority of magnificent intellectual and spiritual power. Names like Fosdick, Faunce, Vedder, and Horr mean enlightenment and goodness. But the control of the Church, both North and South, is in the hands of the great popular leaders when they care to use it. It

was they who in 1922 turned inciters and fanatics and created Fundamentalism. Such a man among them as Jasper C. Massee, of the Southern Baptist school of religious hysteria and orgiasm, who now ministers to the largest church in Boston, exercises an hypnotic power over his credulous crowds. When, for instance, he preached on the earthquake in Japan several years ago, and told the great audience that he spoke "the judgment of God" when he declared that "it was coming to" Boston to suffer such a catastrophe, and that the next morning they might find the streets strewn with the bodies of dead and dying, the people sat stark. The whole country has its opinion of Dr. Straton, the Calvary showman, whose terrific eloquence and catastrophic language make him a menace over a populace. Rev. J. Frank Norris, the Texan, the day after he shot and killed a man in his study—an action for which he was duly acquitted in his own hegemony as everybody knew he would be—drew a milling multitude of devoted zealots to his tabernacle. His power has intimidated the religious leaders of the Lone Star State and driven more than one honest man from its borders. In "Elmer

Gantry," Mr. Sinclair Lewis dealt with a relatively minor character.

These men are not "sports," that is, offshoots, in the Baptist Church. They are highly developed types of their illiberal religion. The churches they command are among the largest in the denomination. That they have recently restrained themselves somewhat is due to a fear of disrupting the Church and by no means to a weakening on Fundamentalism. They declared an "armistice" at the Northern Baptist Convention in 1926, on Dr. Massee's proposal; which means only that Fundamentalism holds it ground.

Such a Baptist scholar as President W. H. P. Faunce of Brown University, in an heroic and vain effort to stem the onrushing tide of crazed religion, asked, "Why is this great denomination torn by dissension and threatened with disruption?" He would not blame it on the Great War, once a fashionable explanation for many of our sins. "The fault is not in our stars, or our age, or in European battlefields, but in ourselves." He said: "The preacher of little education and fervid oratory crowds his church by sensational denunciation of Christian leaders of his time and baptizes

scores of those who do not think but are content to feel. The larger his church grows, the greater is the peril to the Christian faith. The throngs that assemble weekly to hear ridicule poured upon science and art and education, and to hear marvelous expositions of impending catastrophe are the same throngs that take their politics from the cartoonists of the daily press. When these popular gifts drive out Christian teachers of blameless life, because they cannot subscribe to a shibboleth, the alienation of intelligence from Christianity proceeds apace . . . The preacher is in the position of the moving picture. The audience is composed of children or childish minds."

Because what Dr. Faunce said was true, the Baptists went on their mad career. Although they boast of their historic freedom, although in theory each congregation is its own authority and not subject to a higher ecclesiastical power, there is, as a matter of fact, a dogmatic body of belief among this people as effectual and rigorous as that among the very doctrinal Presbyterians. That the Fundamentalist controversy began and the cause was born with the Baptists, is proof that as a mind they are aliens and strangers to their

own immortal Roger Williams. His present-day brethren, who glory chiefly in his victorious fight for individual freedom, have taken precisely the same intolerant course toward those of their own household who desire to think God's thoughts for themselves as the hardened Pilgrims took against Williams.

Out of the Church and into the night rode these Fundamentalist Ku-Kluxers, spreading terror and intimidation, outraging the intelligence of their denomination, cutting the nerve of missions, stilling the voice of prophets and evangels, and altogether making the most pathetic and terrible spectacle that ever brought disaster to religion. And what is worse, they won!

Baptists became the leaders of Fundamentalism, that is, of majority American Protestantism. The historian will take due account of this profoundly important fact.

THE PRESBYTERIANS

It was the most popular preacher of our day Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, a Baptist, who brought the Fundamentalist issue to the Presbyterians. To-day we remember Fosdick as

his recessional moved down the aisle of the First Presbyterian Church in New York City, in which he was serving as stated preacher, and out of Fifth Avenue into his own Baptist Church on Park Avenue where he is now safe and serene. That picturesque transit was the end of one chapter and the beginning of another. It is full of real meaning. The Presbyterians are ninety-five per cent. strict Calvinists. They are deep in doctrine. Now Calvinism and Fundamentalism are the same thing under the skin, and only the labels on the "five points" in each of the two great systems are different. At this time—1922—the Presbyterians had been muttering against Dr. Fosdick as a Baptist "interloper" in one of their leading pulpits, who had not openly accepted the Westminster Confession. As the months passed, the Baptists kept up their barrage. The word "Fundamentalism" was definitely added to the nomenclature of religion, and the Presbyterians realized that they "belonged." They were the first non-Baptist Fundamentalists. The attack was intensified, for explicit doctrinal reasons, on the non-subscribing Baptist, Fosdick, and in a little while he became before the world the archetype of

so-called Modernism. He personified the cause as Wilson personified the League of Nations, Gompers, Labor, and Gary, Capital. Dr. Fosdick is still popularly regarded as the leader of anti-Fundamentalism. That he is the lost leader is another story.

For five years he was the occasion of a long and bitter quarrel, which ran through one Presbyterian General Assembly after another and made schism in the Church. When the test came, only one hundred and fifty Presbyterian ministers in a total of ten thousand—that is, one and one-half of one per cent. —made a plea for more liberal allowance in the interpretation of Presbyterian beliefs. Others felt sympathetic but they were afraid. The move did no good. All of the vague talk of Henry Sloane Coffin and William P. Merrill, who tried to resolve the doctrinal perplexities, only increased the intensity and the numbers of opponents. Fosdick made his exit, and Calvin and the sixteenth century still dominate the Church. Only the contention over the control of Princeton Theological Seminary ruffles the Presbyterian mind. This situation is of great significance, because it

points to the basic difference among Presbyterians.

It is necessary for one to keep clearly and constantly in mind that at Princeton the conflict is not over doctrine but over the way men hold their doctrine. This ancient conservative stronghold is not shifting its dogmatic foundations in the least. Modern scientific method has not affected any one of the Calvinistic (which means Fundamentalistic) articles of faith. They stand fast. It is entirely a question of tolerance of one another among the faculty members, in their varying shades of emphasis on central doctrines. Dr. J. Gresham Machen is the preëminent New Testament scholar in the seminary, and an inflexible Fundamentalist. He deserves unstinted commendation for outspoken honesty and loyalty to his principles. In this respect, he is the most admirable person on the faculty. He pursues his living logic to the end. He begins with a premiss, namely, biblical infallibility, with its corollary, the deity of Jesus as given in the Bible story of the Virgin Birth. He considers this the central teaching of the whole Presbyterian system, and of course he is right. There

are other members of the faculty, Prof. Charles R. Erdman, for example, who believes as Machen believes, but they speak softly and lay the stress of their teaching and preaching on less doctrinal and more practical subjects. Machen declares that the seminary should defend the faith. He holds that a Presbyterian theological school is maintained to indoctrinate its students with Presbyterian principles. Who will say this is unreasonable? He is not only zealous and consecrated to his holy task, as nobody will deny, but he insists that all men who have vowed, on accepting their office, to teach the church's faith should not violate their solemn obligation. Naturally, he has made himself very much disliked. He has been severe in his strictures, and the reaction against him has been rigorous. No fault can be found by his colleagues with his theology,—at least, not openly,—because he is staunchly loyal to that which he has sworn to believe and teach; but they call him unbrotherly and contentious and a source of dissidence in the seminary. That is why, when he was nominated to be promoted to the full professorship of apologetics two years ago, the nomination was turned down by the General Assembly, as it was

again in 1927. They would like to get rid of him. But what a scandal, what a row, if they should do so! Machen's present rank is assistant professor of New Testament and Exegesis. He is a real scholar in the schoolman's sense of the term. He represents to a nicety the consistency of one who is produced by a theological system. What Princeton needs, if one may say so, is not a perennial rebuke of Machen, who is what they have made him, *par excellence,* but an enduement of that grace which first understands and then repents of its antiquated and deadly fundamentalism, so that the seminary may be born again and no more Machens may arise to plague the defenders of a static system which cannot serve a living and growing spiritual world. But Princeton and its Church will pursue a medieval career for many a decade. Some day in dim futurity a crash may come, as Dr. William E. Gilroy, editor of the *Congregationalist,* has said, and then the dawn of liberation! But the Presbyterians to-day have accepted the situation. The great majority rejoice in it, a small number are simply reconciled to it as something that is and cannot be otherwise, and a thin, almost invisible fringe

agonizes and is silent. The total effect, after all the storm and stress of the past decade, is that the Presbyterians have settled back into theological darkness.

THE METHODISTS

By sheer good fortune, we say it advisedly, the Methodists have escaped the devastating effects of the Fundamentalist movement. They differ in dogmatic principle not a whit from the Presbyterians, but they are more emotional in their religion and more plastic in their internal politics than any church in America, not excepting the Roman Catholic Church. Methodist diplomacy is a fine art. Let it be declared also that the Methodist Church is a great communion whose service to humanity is in many respects generous and edifying. But the Church is still in creedal bonds with all the others, and because this is so it does occasionally a mean and devilish cruelty. It is the price it pays for creedal regularity. A man in Methodism can go so far and then—the screws.

One recalls a representative case,—the undoing in 1905 of Prof. Hinckley G. Mitchell,

teacher of the Old Testament in the School of Theology in Boston University. He was a saintly man and very learned. He taught what even then the best Christian scholarship was a unit in declaring, namely, that the historic character of parts of the Book of Genesis was not established. The bishops, spurred by the complaint of some inconspicuous and narrow-minded pastor, said Dr. Mitchell was teaching the Bible in a way to "be objectionable" and "having a tendency to invalidate the authority of other portions of the Scripture." Please note in passing that the infallibility of the Bible is the ultimate dogma held in common by Protestants. He was not formally cited for trial. There are indirect and not less effectual ways of making away with troublesome men, and in this case it was a simple matter. By refusing to reappoint Mitchell to his professorship for another year, the ends would be attained without a scandalous trial. The public press always takes the heretic's side, and the churches know it. The bishops would not at first take unfavorable action, but passed the buck to the faculty of the School of Theology, without saying whether Mitchell should or should not retain his chair. The

faculty passed it back again, and then the decision came flat, final, and crucifying. Mitchell was finished.

There are noble-minded Methodists who to this day hang their heads when the name of this martyr is mentioned. The Church literally and by inches killed a rare scholar, a thoroughly orthodox follower of Christ, and a beautiful soul. It gives one pain akin to heartbreak to cite this example, and it is not with reproach primarily of the Methodists, but of the destroying system known as Fundamentalism which is responsible for the helplessness of the Church. "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die."

If there be a rejoinder that such a wicked thing could not happen again, a contemporary case will decisively correct any false hope. In Aurora, Nebraska, Rev. J. D. M. Buckner went through an inquisition in 1922. His passing was the dénouement of a church tragedy in which he was the heroic and unpretentious figure. Mr. Buckner was a popular Methodist pastor, devoted and successful. His people loved him, and he taught them well. But he went, and even his well-known son, Emory R. Buckner, at the time United

States District Attorney of New York, who fought the heresy-hunters, could not save the father. Rev. Mr. Buckner's sin was in using his intelligence on behalf of a normal, open-minded, responsive congregation. He faced the question (as ministers must),—

When the Bible teaches something that is at variance with the standards of Christ, what shall we believe, the Bible or Christ?

He answered, Christ.

He did not believe that God drowned like rats all the people on the earth except the Noah family. The Bible teaches this.

He did not believe God ordered the Hebrews to kill the Canaanites. The Bible says He did.

He did not believe God destroyed seventy thousand innocent people with a plague. The Bible so declares.

He did not believe God told the Jews they might sell rotten meat to the Gentiles, but not to their own people. This is the Bible record.

He did not believe that if a man gathered sticks on the Sabbath for a fire to keep himself warm he must be killed. According to the Bible, he must be.

There were many other things in the Bible

Rev. Mr. Buckner did not believe because in his thinking Christ would not sanction them. What happened? Mr. Buckner's bishop, Homer C. Stuntz, was indignant, and plainly told the offending one it would be hard to find him a church. But, said the congregation in Aurora, unanimously, we want our minister returned to us! They so telegraphed the Bishop. They commissioned a delegation to go to the Conference. But Mr. Buckner was doomed. They "retired" him, with the pretext that he was sixty-five years of age. He is a man of remarkable vigor. He had no trial, nor even a hearing. The episode was so disgraceful that the public press rebuked this Church of God. Bishop Stuntz was unnerved. He died soon afterwards. This is the Fundamentalist system!

When the ecclesiastical machinery of John Wesley's children is oiled and coaled, God help those who come to judgment! Not one of their ministers, not even a great Bishop like the leader of them all, Francis J. McConnell, would fare better than Pastor Buckner if he committed the same offense. Is it remarkable that careful Methodists do not speak of religious liberty? They know the truth.

THE EPISCOPALIANS

Another prelate—William Lawrence, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts—ventured, in October of 1923, on the day he was thirty years in that office, to declare his religious freedom. It was generally assumed that the intelligence and culture of this superior communion had become so firmly established that one, though a Bishop, might speak about these things as gentlemen do in their clubs and their homes. Lawrence had commonly done so in private. Surely, there is none of this foolishness called Fundamentalism in *the* Church!

Bishop Lawrence (he has since voluntarily retired, having reached the age of seventy years) soon learned what Episcopalianism thinks. Verily, it thinks like all the rest. Liberty is not in it or of it. Every Episcopal nave echoed and every spire trembled when he said bluntly in his address that the Bible is not infallible; that the doctrine of the resurrection of the fleshly body is of no significance; that the Trinity is not describable, but God is *one,* that is sure; that the atonement of Jesus was not substitutionary but exemplary, made in

the same spirit as that of the soldier at Gettysburg; that many so-called miracles he simply does not believe; and, to cap his catalogue, the Virgin Birth is not an essential doctrine. In plain language, Bishop Lawrence knocked Fundamentalism cold. For him, it was dead from head to toe. And at that he was only repeating the common beliefs of emancipated men. But he did not reckon the host. The next month the House of Bishops was to meet at Dallas. The time came. Under the leadership of the chief of Episcopalian Fundamentalists, Bishop William T. Manning, seconded by the legal wisdom of that preëminent layman of the same dogmatic school, George Wharton Pepper, then United States Senator from Pennsylvania, they disposed officially in a Pastoral Letter of all heretics and heresies. Among important votes, the Bishops unanimously adopted the following:

"Objections to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth or to the bodily resurrection are not only contrary to the Christian tradition, but have been abundantly dealt with by the best scholarship of the day . . . Profession of the Apostles' Creed as a summary of Christian belief stands and has stood from early days along

with renunciation of evil and the promise of obedience to God's commandments as a condition of baptism."

Bishop Lawrence, it was everywhere understood, was the object of the foregoing warning, as well as of the following:

"A clergyman, whether deacon, priest, or bishop, as a condition of receiving his ministerial commission, is required to promise conformity to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church. To deny, or to treat as immaterial, belief in the Creed in which at every regular service of the church both minister and congregation profess to believe, is to trifle with words and cannot but expose us to the suspicion and the danger of dishonesty and unreality. Honesty in the use of language—to say what we mean and mean what we say—is not least important with regard to religious language and especially our approach to Almighty God."

The Episcopal Church was divided, and the vast majority was against Bishop Lawrence. If he were not of aristocratic family tradition, a power in council, and the greatest money-gatherer in the church's history, what might have befallen him? For much less than he said,

Rev. Lee W. Heaton, of Fort Worth, Texas, at this time lost his parish and left the State. Not a word came from Lawrence in the teeth of the gale of admonition. He withdrew to his busy diocesan duties.

And now there is no more outward Fundamentalist striving, for the Fundamentalists have their way. Men like Dr. Elwood Worcester and Dr. Leighton Parks spoke vehemently against the miserable menace for a season, but the former became silent and the latter recanted his hot denunciation of the Bishops' Pastoral Letter from Dallas (which he was obliged to read in his church), and there you are! The ruling power of the Protestant Episcopalians is exactly like the ruling power of the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and every other creedal denomination. They are neither Protestant nor American, but Fundamentalist and monarchic. Over them is the shadow and the night of the Christian religion.

V

THE FUNDAMENTALISTS POSSESS THE LAND

IT is Springtime in 1922. Two voices speak. The father of the Fundamentalists, Dr. Curtis Lee Laws, says: "We came into existence to do battle royal for the faith of our fathers. If we are eighty-five per cent. of the Church,—and we are,—why on earth should we not rule?" The evangel of the Modernists, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, replies: "Not for one moment do I believe that the Fundamentalists are going to succeed in driving out from the Christian Church all who do not agree with them. They are not going to do it." We quote from the record. Almost as the words were uttered, the crash came. And despite Dr. Fosdick, the Fundamentalists *have* done it. They rule the Church. It is true those who disagreed with them were not banished. They were simply overwhelmed. Two spiritual worlds, irreconcilable, met in inevitable collision. Nothing like it had been seen in

Christendom in four hundred years. The world of medieval dogma swept madly upon the world of spiritual freedom—darkness against the light. The night drove out the day.

As the *Christian Century,* at that time fearlessly, faithfully Modernist, said, looking upon the riven churches of American Protestantism, "They may sing 'Blest Be the Tie That Binds' till doomsday, but they cannot bind these two worlds together. There is a clash here as profound and grim as that between Christianity and Confucianism. Amiable words cannot hide the difference."

"The God of the Fundamentalist is one God," said this paper; "the God of the Modernist is another. The Christ of the Fundamentalist is one Christ; the Christ of the Modernist is another. The Bible of Fundamentalism is one book; the Bible of Modernism is another. The Church, the Kingdom, the salvation, the consummation of all things—these are one thing to the Fundamentalists and another to the Modernists. Which God is the Christian God, which Christ is the Christian Christ, which Bible is the Christian Bible, which church, which kingdom, which salvation,

which consummation are the Christian church, the Christian kingdom, the Christian salvation, the Christian consummation? The future will tell. But that the issue is clear and that the inherent incompatibility of the two worlds passed the stage of mutual tolerance is a fact concerning which there hardly seems room for any one to doubt." And it was true. This declaration was brave and remarkable, for the *Christian Century* depends in large part for its existence upon Fundamentalist subscribers. It was inconceivable that it could persist in this heroic strain of liberation and yet survive. It did not persist; but the conflict was upon us and it rose to fierce, tremendous heights. With a smite of shame we learned that we are not yet so wise and good that we

> Understand our own age and the next,
> And make the present ready to fulfill
> Its prophecy, and with the future merge
> Gently and peacefully, as wave with wave.

Engulfed we were, instead, in a seething vortex. Ministers of milder spirit cried, "Peace, peace!" but there was no peace. Amiable tolerance could not prevail against a major

issue that plumbs the depths of the human soul. And, after all, is it not true that whenever the Church is awake, it is a Church militant, combatting false and outgrown ideas, contending for a larger and fuller life? A distinguished churchman and lover of peace, Dr. Charles E. Jefferson answered in the affirmative. "The ages in which the Church has been peculiarly alert and mentally aggressive," he said, "are the ages in which strong men have contended valiantly for ideas which clashed with public opinion. We have arrived at a season of controversy, and it is a good sign. It is the Lord's doing and we ought to accept it as a part of the discipline of life."

He illustrated his belief with a great historic case. "Paul was one of the mightiest controversialists of all history. If he had not fought with all his might against men in the church whose ideas he felt sure made void the gospel of Christ, the Christian religion would have been strangled in its cradle. Only dead ages in history have been quiet."

If, as one might infer, it is a sign of religious awakening when strife over religious ideas prevails, we have been living in one of the booming, golden ages of the race. In every

The Second Coming

Original and Paraphrase

According to Revelation XIX: 11-16 Authorized Version	According to Rev. Dr. I. M. Haldeman Fundamentalist
His eyes were as a flame of fire, and he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood.—*Verses* 12, 13.	Christ is coming with the eyes of one who is aroused and indignant. His garments are dipped in blood, the blood of others.
And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses.—*Verse* 14.	And those who follow this emergent, wrathful King are represented as armies. They come forth to assist the warrior to make war on the earth.
And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations.—*Verse* 15.	He comes as a king, an autocrat, a despot, through the gushing blood of a trampled world.
He shall rule them with a rod of iron.—*Verse* 15.	He comes forth as one who no longer seeks friendship or love. He will enunciate his claim by terror and might.
He treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.—*Verse* 15.	He comes like the treader of the winepress, and the grapes are the bodies of men. He will tread and trample in his fury till the blood of men shall fill the earth. He will tread and trample them till their upspurting blood shall make him crimson.

sect the forces mobilized, each certain that it was the army of the Lord, and within a few months everybody in Christendom was something he had never been before. He was either a Fundamentalist or a Modernist. The subject of religion and doctrine was alive and kicking. A remark made by Dr. Charles W. Pipkin, now of the University of Louisiana, to the author, who was the first to precipitate the Fundamentalist issue before the country, in the *Christian Register,* was widely quoted. "I congratulate you," he said, "for having made theology the breakfast-table talk in the homes of the common people." Soon the Fundamentalists were an innumerable, irresistible host. They marched against the minorities in their own denominations, beginning with the clash of members in local congregations, following with the contest of delegates to district meetings of conferences and synods, and coming finally to the great struggles in the supreme judicatories of the churches, such as the Presbyterian General Assembly, the Methodist General Conference, and the Northern Baptist Convention. In effect, they demanded surrender to their faith and stood fast until it was granted.

In no creedal Church was there a single defeat of any Fundamentalist dogma. That holds to this day. In five years they have won control of the churches with a total membership running into more than thirty millions of souls. The Fundamentalists possess the land.

An impressive instance in confirmation of this momentous and true statement is to be found in the Report of the Presbyterians' Special Commission on Constitutional and Doctrinal Issues, adopted by the General Assembly in 1927. Here is an historic document; it is the most important declaration of this communion, in the deliberate judgment of informed Presbyterians, since 1789, when the Constitution of the Church was adopted. The commission was appointed during the awful conflict of the Church with its New York Presbytery, which permitted young candidates for the ministry, trained in modernist schools, to be neutral or non-committal on certain doctrines, notably the Virgin Birth. Dr. Fosdick's case on the same point also had much to do with it. The findings of this august commission are embodied in a marvelously cogent argument which in dialectic skill vies with the encyclicals of Popes, the edicts

of diets, and the confessions of ecumenical conferences throughout church history. The one supreme question the Commission answered was, "What authority, if any, does the General Assembly possess for declaring any article [of belief] to be an essential and necessary one in a sense which renders its statement mandatory and applicable to all cases?" Through many ingenious and crystal paragraphs one comes at last to this conclusion, "The General Assembly has an undoubted right to interpret the Constitution," and "all must recognize the duty of the Assembly from time to time to bear general witness, as there may be need, to the corporate faith of the Church." The Commissioners do not recommend frequent exercise of this right, however, for they say it "may lead, as experience has shown, to disturbing results." Nevertheless, it is reaffirmed by the Commission that the Word of God is the Scripture, and this is the authority of the Church. The biblical doctrine of the Virgin Birth, which is one of the five points of Fundamentalism declared to be the Church's doctrine by the General Assembly in Indianapolis in 1925, was reaffirmed in 1927. It was not only a positive vote on this subject that

the Assembly passed, thanks to the Elder of Chester Presbytery, as we have seen, but also a negative action against two young men desiring ordination who expressed doubts about the Virgin Birth. They were declared unfit for the ministry for this reason by the General Assembly. Such examples are common not in the Presbyterian Church only, but in all the creedal churches, and they cannot and will not be denied by the ecclesiastical powers. These churches are caught in Fundamentalist logic, and for the life of themselves they cannot escape Fundamentalist control.

What is a Fundamentalist, and why? He is a new phenomenon, but an old reality. That is, the typical Protestant has always been a doctrinal Fundamentalist, but now, instead of being primarily in one of the nearly two hundred sects, he is first a Fundamentalist, a member of the religious party of the right which is the great majority in the churches. The chief cornerstone of the Fundamentalists is the theory that the Bible is the inerrant word of God. Charles Gallaudet Trumbull, one of their great figures, and Editor of the *Sunday School Times,* gives a cogent statement on the subject.

"The position of the Fundamentalist [he says] is this: That the entire Bible, as given by the Holy Spirit to the original writers in the original autograph manuscripts, is authoritative and infallible; that is, that the Word of God is as free from error as the person of God. Therefore, the Fundamentalist believes in an infallible Bible, and that this Book is infallible because it was all given supernaturally by the Holy Spirit of God himself, and is unique among the books of the world; there is none other like it.

"The Fundamentalist claims for himself, and gives to others, large liberty in the realm of interpretation of Scripture, but he is careful never to permit that word 'interpretation' to mean rejection of Scripture. When the Bible, for example, declares that a certain fact occurred in history, at a certain time and place, the Fundamentalist accepts that as a historical fact, and denies the right of men to 'interpret' the fact away and make of it only a figure of speech or a parable.

"The Fundamentalist believes that the Bible is as unerringly accurate in every statement that touches upon what we call science, in such realms as geology, or astronomy, or human or

animal origins, as it is in the realm of spiritual truth and the way of salvation for lost men. The Fundamentalist, in other words, is jealous for the integrity of the Word, and cannot admit, for himself or others, that there is any flaw or imperfection, any ignorance or mistake, occurring anywhere in the Bible in its records of historical fact, of scientific matters, or of spiritual truth. And if the 'findings' of modern science conflict with statements in the Bible, the Fundamentalist believes the Bible, even if it differs with modern science. The 'findings' of science have changed every decade, even oftener than that, so that much of what science taught a generation ago is admitted by scientific men in the whole world today to be ridiculous ignorance. But 'the word of God . . . liveth and abideth for ever' (1 Pet. i. 23)."

This infallibility the Fundamentalists believe, though not all of them are militant in their zeal. As in any great mass of people, many are indifferent and passive; but no Fundamentalist is militant on the side of freedom, that is sure; and for all practical purposes it may be said with strict accuracy that

those who are not against Fundamentalism are for it. They contribute to its prevalence and its power.

No true Modernist would deny to any man a perfect right to believe what he will. The issue arose not because the Fundamentalist held the theory of infallibility, but because he determined to make everybody else believe as he did. Tolerance of free opinion was no part of his program. His first attack was on his own church, which meant, in fact, every creedal sect in Christendom. Successful there beyond his dreams, he proceeded to make his dogma the law of the country, by means of legislation in the States. Though crude were his tactics in the beginning, he burned with a holy zeal, and his political technique is reaching a high degree of efficiency. It is no fantastic hope that he will re-create the United States, so far as the spirit of its law is concerned, into a virtual Fundamentalist monarchy.

Propitious were the times for the rise of Fundamentalism. The world was tired of sects as it was tired of kings, after the Great War. Nearly two hundred denominations and cults constituted a pathetic scandal. There was no reason for their manifold ex-

istence. Besides, there was a radical difference between two religious schools. The cause of the cleavage runs deep. It is the story of the new knowledge clashing with the old doctrines. How can you harmonize the Genesis story of the instantaneous creation of Adam, for example, with the theory of man's evolution to his present state literally through millions of years? The Fundamentalist said it cannot be done. Some half-way Modernists try to "interpret" the Bible symbolically so that it can be done. But the Fundamentalist is right. Holding his dogma of a Book inspired in all its parts as more precious than life, he was consistent in his resolve to act. Within a few months a new alignment was drawn throughout the country. Instead of the old vertical lines that separated the many churches like so many spite fences, one horizontal line of division runs through all the churches, with the Fundamentalists on one side and the Modernists on the other. A Fundamentalist Methodist is much closer to a Fundamentalist Episcopalian both spiritually and intellectually than he is to a Methodist Modernist. It is true throughout Protestantism. And, as Amos observed

nearly three thousand years ago, if you differ with a man on basic principles, you separate from him. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" You ought to be decent and brotherly toward him but you oppose him on the matters of disagreement. No tender ingratiation by Modernists toward Fundamentalists can change this fact. It is a principle of life. It also proves that doctrines do matter almost more than anything else about religion. It has always been so. A new religious atmosphere was breathed into the world, and the saying of R. H. Tawney was pertinent: "There is a moral and religious, as well as a material environment, which sets its stamp on the individual, even when he is least conscious of it." Fundamentalism came to make a man conscious of the stamp. But it did not requite the kindliness of the Modernist, as one might have expected of Christians.

Never in all the centuries of Christendom has there been a more terrific battle of brother against brother. To oppose the horde of onrushing defenders of the faith was to invite destruction; and self-preservation is the first law of nature. But stay! One orthodox man did arise. Prof. Henry C. Vedder of Crozer

Theological Seminary was the only person in an official place in Pan-Protestantism who stood openly and clearly, bravely and dangerously for the Modernist cause. He wrote a book as the holy warfare was waging. In it he said that "the ministers who know better are cowards not to speak." "They are afraid to tell their people the truth about the Bible," he declared. "They fear they may unsettle men's minds. No man's faith was ever wrecked by truth who had a faith worth saving!"

Dr. Vedder held back no churchly secrets. The clergy, he said, has been bribed to keep quiet, with all the "honors, wealth, social consideration" of this world; and they had been threatened with "disgrace, persecution, death." That is the naked and shameful truth. On the doctrine of infallibility he said, "There is no educated man living who really believes the Bible from cover to cover . . . Men who say such things are talking buncombe, playing to the galleries . . . Speak, my brothers in the ministry of the grace of God; speak as you are called to be God's prophets; speak the truth without dilution or camouflage; and with God be the rest!"

But the brethren did not speak. Every creedal church intimidated its Modernist ministers. Their tongues clove to the roof of their mouths. They knew what would befall them if they spoke what burned and then died in their heart.

As fear and silence crept into the soul of Modernism, Fundamentalism grew and became all-powerful. It is an historic factor in religion, responsible for an epoch as significant as any period in the nineteen centuries of the Church. The word "Fundamentalist" belongs to the permanent nomenclature of Christianity. Dr. Laws himself coined the term in its accepted religious usage when he led the Fundamentalist movement in 1920, in Des Moines, Iowa, where twelve hundred Baptist ministers met in conference, to consider the doctrinal condition of the Church, before the regular Northern Baptist Convention. This was indeed the origin of Fundamentalism. The conservatives were indignant and determined. Liberal Baptists must be kept under, removed from important educational and mission offices, and the Church purged of its heresy. The conservative rump movement wrestled, sweated, and brought forth their five points

of the faith, prefaced by a resolution that these "fundamentals" must be supreme. They marched into the convention proper, and threw the mind of the whole church—more than seven millions of people—into disorder, confusion, and bitterness. These five points—the infallible Bible, the Virgin Birth of Jesus, the substitutionary atonement, the carnal resurrection, and the second coming of Jesus in his physical body—were destined to rule Protestantism. They are in the texture and tissue of every creedal Church. The Baptists, with their freer congregational polity, which has the advantage of fluid movement and action, thus rose to churchly supremacy, and submerged the Presbyterians, whose system of theology had been predominant in Protestantism four hundred years.

In making their "fundamentals" effective, the organized Fundamentalists communicated with all Baptist preachers and teachers, demanding that the true doctrines be taught and none other. One of these letters was received by President Ernest M. Hopkins, of Dartmouth College. He is a Baptist, but the college is an old royal charter institution, under no denominational control whatever. Hopkins

is a skillful controversialist and publicity engineer. To the impertinence that "no teacher should be permitted to continue" who does not accept and express the "fundamentals," he shot back an epistle which first rebuked attempted interference in a free college and then asserted that this "poisoned cup" of dogmatism was abhorrent. Political and economic pressure was not unknown to college presidents, he declared, but religious bigotry was pernicious and demoralizing beyond all other tyrannies. To restrict the thinking of man was to abandon the spirit of Christ, he said, and close the doors of truth. It would drive the best minds out of the Baptist Church.

At this point the *Christian Register,* "A Journal of Free Churches," in its issue of February 23, 1922, and for weeks afterwards, sensed the larger significance of the Hopkins letter in trenchant editorials. It attacked the whole system of Fundamentalism, naming the men and the institutions which were fostering the spiritual menace. With journalistic intuition, the *Boston Herald,* noted newspaper in New England, understood the meaning of the movement, took the first three *Register* articles, and published a digest of them, with com-

ment, in a sympathetic "leader" on March 9, 1922. It was written by F. Lauriston Bullard, the *Herald's* chief editorial writer, who won the Pulitzer Prize in 1926 for his Sacco-Vanzetti editorial which led to a review of that celebrated case. The power and prestige of a daily journal, devoted to the public service, aided mightily in bringing the issue before the world. The press everywhere was alive to something new under the religious sun! Religion was first-page news.

The method of the *Register* was simple. It hammered away at the most vulnerable spot in the Fundamentalist system,—the fifth point, the Second Coming, which is based on the first point, Bible infallibility. If the Bible is infallible, ran the obvious reasoning, then the Second Coming of Jesus is true, for it appears a half dozen places in the New Testament. In particular, the version in Revelation xix: 11-16 was cited. A famous Fundamentalist, Dr. I. M. Haldeman of New York City, has paraphrased it, as follows:

> Christ is coming with the eyes of one who is aroused and indignant, in whose veins beats the pulse of a hot anger . . . He

comes forth as one who no longer seeks either friendship or love . . . His garments are dipped in blood, the blood of others. He descends that he may shed the blood of men . . . He will enunciate his claim by terror and might. He will write it in the blood of his foes. He comes like the treader of the winepress, and the grapes are the bodies of men. He will tread and trample in his fury till the blood of men shall fill the earth . . . He will tread and trample them beneath his accusing feet, till their upspurting blood shall make him crimson . . . He comes to his glory not as the Saviour meek and lowly, not through the suffrage of willing hearts and the plaudits of a welcoming world, but as a king, an autocrat, a despot, through the gushing blood of a trampled world. And those who follow this emergent, wrathful King of Heaven . . . are represented as armies. They come forth as a body of fighters. They come forth to assist the Warrior to make war on the earth. In this way the Kingdom is to come, not by the preaching of the Gospel and the all-persuasive power of the Spirit of God.

This hideous, monstrous description of the religion of Jesus by a prominent Christian

clergyman, made the blood curdle. The implications of it caused people to stand mute, aghast. Yet, strange to relate, there was not in the whole Protestant ministry of the creedal churches a single great voice, nor any of the smaller ones to the best of my knowledge, who boldly denied that this was Christianity. The ministers of Christ faced an epochal crisis and they were dumb.

VI

THE LOST LEADERS

A MINISTER is a public character because religion is a public function. The Church of every faith opens its doors to the world, and the intention inside is to persuade all people and all institutions to the beliefs which the Church propagates. That is its business. Religion is not a private sect, it is a civilization. It curses or blesses society. John Wesley said the world was his parish, and the Methodists have followed his vision, in some instances too strenuously and politically; but nevertheless they have become a great spiritual power because they have conceived their vocation in universal terms. They flourish on open controversy, and to combat their enemies in public causes is as the breath of their nostrils.

With the rise of a united Fundamentalism and the ceasing of sectarian jealousies among the denominations, the ablest ministers have become as conspicuous in the public eye as

politicians and educators; and likewise the clergy have to stand the gaff of public criticism. It is a new experience. But they cannot expect to enjoy immunity. They were once protected from attack, but that was in a time when people held the notion that religion, that is, the Church, stood in ascetic aloofness,—when the world was regarded as a "sphere of unrighteousness" from which, as R. H. Tawney says, "men *may* escape—from which, if they consider their souls, they *will* escape—but which they can conquer only by flight."

It is a simple historic fact that the great Churchmen in history have fought and overcome the world and not fled it. Renown and immortality have been won as much by their part in the economic, social, and political reconstruction of society as by their labor of converting the so-called heathen and building the Church. The great theologian has also been the reformer. John Calvin wrote his classic Institutes of theology, and all the world knows about them; but it does not remember that when Geneva in Switzerland needed a municipal housecleaning they sent for Calvin and he did the job so well that to this day it is regarded by many people as the best city in

Europe. The man who had worked out, in his great system, the plans and specifications for the City of God, was the logical person to prove them. But in the major necessity of our time,—religious and political freedom,—there are no Calvins. In that holy cause our Modernist ministers are lost leaders. To their praise be it said these men did make a great adventure these past years, trying to bring a new heaven, and then, God pity them, they retreated. To call the roll would be like a solemn ceremony over the innumerable departed. But there are some names that are well known.

Among them all Harry Emerson Fosdick is *facile princeps*. He is the most conspicuous preacher in the American Church. He once looked like the Captain of the Host who would liberate the Churches from their dogmatic bonds and their political intolerance. He wanted to do it. He came back from the trenches during the Great War and with sublime indignation and understanding assailed the preposterous behavior of conventional religion. He wrote a phillipic for the *Atlantic Monthly* that sent a galvanic thrill up the spinal column of the Church. For some it was

perfidious, for others it was glorious, but for all it was revolutionary. He made a noise like a major prophet. Then for a season he was quiet. But when the Fundamentalists in the Baptist Church threatened its disruption, he preached, after some urging, the famous sermon, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" He was set upon by a pack of them, ravening, and from that time forth he has lived in safety, far from the battle of the Modernists, which, with him as its leader, would probably have been victorious and the world would have had a new Reformation, or very nearly. Dr. Fosdick has gone now to be the minister of the Rockefellers' Church, and there is little promise that his voice will again resound for freedom. He who might have been our Luther prefers to be a popular preacher. He is a lost leader.

It is said of Dr. Fosdick that he does not like a fight. His temper is "evangelical." Dr. Fosdick was greatly alarmed about the effect of his sermon, according to Joseph E. McAfee, and "he has never done it again." The New York Presbytery disapproved it, and the preacher from that time onward has chosen undebatable themes. He is no longer a source

of annoyance to the Fundamentalists, because he is no longer a leader, but rather, as Mr. McAfee says, a type, one of a group. The Protestant Churches are full of them. He speaks freshly and broadly about current affairs (like a first-rate magazine writer or a lecturer) and his hearers think he is a true Modernist theologian. But topics of the day are not religious doctrine. Dr. Fosdick reminds one of Dean Inge.

It was real religious wrestling with Fosdick in the beginning when he said that the Bible contained many of the gross stories and immoral standards of human character that one finds in the Koran. He reached heights of sound "higher criticism" that left one almost breathless because he foretold a new day. "One point of view," he said, "is that the original documents of the Scripture were inerrantly dictated by God to men . . . The Koran similarly has been regarded by Mohammedans as having been infallibly written in heaven before it came to earth. But the Koran enshrines the theological and ethical ideas of Arabia at the time when it was written. God an Oriental monarch, fatalistic submission to his will as man's chief duty, the use of force on

unbelievers, polygamy, slavery—they are all in the Koran . . . All of these ideas, which we dislike in the Koran, are somewhere in the Bible. Conceptions from which we now send missionaries to convert Mohammedans are to be found in the Book. There one can find God thought of as an Oriental monarch; there, too, are patriarchal polygamy, and slave systems, and the use of force on unbelievers."

Dr. Fosdick proceeded to show the historical development from these revolting ideas to purer ones, as in the teaching of Jesus, but the point that he made paramount was that the Fundamentalist—who is the typical Protestant—makes no such distinction, and accepts the Bible, as we have seen in the definition by Dr. Trumbull, with absolute literalness, from Genesis to Revelation. Not that only, but the Fundamentalist would drive out of the Church all who, like Dr. Fosdick, hold to a truly modern, historical, and spiritual view.

At the time the famous Fosdick sermon, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" (from which the foregoing is taken) was preached, on Sunday, May 21, 1922, the whole land was in a religious furore, and it is not extravagant to say that at no earlier period in American

history has there been a more fanatical state of mind. It was an astounding revelation of how little spiritual enlightenment the Churches had shed upon the souls of the people, in spite of the vaunted advance of breadth of sympathy, tolerance among Christians, the progress of religious education, and the enthusiastic talk about Church unity by the valetudinarians. The heat and hate were rampant.

Dr. Fosdick has preferred from that day to utter no word in furtherance of his transforming theme. The loss due to his withdrawal and silence is inestimable. In that same discourse, when he was brave and daring, and had the prophet's passion for the people, he said that such doctrines as the Virgin Birth, the substitutionary atonement, and the second coming as believed intolerantly by the Fundamentalists, were not believed by Liberals, among whom he plainly included himself. He said, "If a man is a genuine Liberal, his primary protest is not against holding these opinions, although he may well protest against their being considered the fundamentals of Christianity." Let us take one specific doctrine, as an example of Dr. Fosdick's treatment of the whole system,—that of the Virgin Birth. He

reviewed and illustrated the idea common in world religions that an extraordinary person can be explained only by a supernatural birth. It was true, he said, in the case of Buddha and Zoroaster, of Lao-Tsze and Mahavira. "Pythagoras was also called virgin born, and Plato, and Augustus Cæsar, and many more." The same tradition, he explained, grew up about Jesus, and the Fundamentalists have "phrased it in a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use." Finally, "the two men who contributed most to the Church's thought of the divine meaning of the Christ were Paul and John, who never even distinctly alluded to the Virgin Birth."

All that is now changed. When Dr. Fosdick came to virtual trial in 1925 before the Presbyterian authorities, who demanded to know what he believed, his reply, though phrased with clever originality, was satisfactory to the Fundamentalists' requirements. Here is Dr. Fosdick's "creed," which the reader will easily analyze for himself:

I believe in the personal God revealed in Christ, in His omnipresent activity and endless resources to achieve His purposes for

us and all men; I believe in Christ, His deity, His sacrificial saviourhood, His resurrected and triumphant life, His rightful lordship, and the indispensableness of His message to mankind.

In the indwelling Spirit I believe, and the forgiveness of sins, the redeemed and victorious life, the triumph of righteousness on earth, and the life everlasting.

This faith I find in the Scriptures, and the object of my ministry is to lead men to the Scriptures as the standard and norm of religious experience—the progressive revelation of God in the history of a unique people, culminating in Christ.

There is not a syllable here that Dr. J. Gresham Machen, the chief of the Presbyterian Fundamentalists, could find fault with. One part that peculiarly determines its quality for the present purpose is Dr. Fosdick's acceptance of the Bible as "the standard and norm of religious experience." (As a parallel with his earlier sermonic stand it makes a conclusive reversal.) Among theologians, "norm" means perfectness. Dr. Fosdick teaches in a theological seminary. He knows. But because he has a contemporaneous attitude and

style, many persons who have been reared in Fundamentalist doctrines and forms of speech and yet have a modern view of the Bible think that he is broadening them when he is only entertaining and enlivening them on the social and ethical questions of the day. This service to many people is no small matter, but its quality is "hardly more than temporary and ephemeral" in any religious sense. There is "little essential difference between the Fundamentalists and the Modernists" of the Fosdick type, says Mr. McAfee. "If asked what are the fundamental doctrines of religion, they will substantially agree . . . The preaching of both groups is alike occupied with turning these doctrines over and over, magnifying their importance and embodying true religion in the ideas and ethics they generate."

A man has a right to his creed, but when he says he is a Modernist, which means that he stands not only for tolerance, but for freedom and the scientific treatment of religious beliefs, that he employs in religion the same method and spirit of inquiry which prevail among intelligent people in all other fields of truth, and leaves no place for dogmatic or other unfounded assertion, then have we not a right to

expect something different in the attitude of Dr. Fosdick?

"There is no salvation except in intellectual freedom."

Other men in the Churches are less conspicuous but not less typical. In general, their paths run parallel to Dr. Fosdick. For example, Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin was regarded as the man to break the bonds in the Presbyterian Church. He fought a good fight, but he did not finish his course. He has become President of Union Theological Seminary, and already he speaks in careful accents and all of his definitive language is of the Fundamentalist variety. Union under his predecessor, A. C. McGiffert, was flatly Modernist. Dr. Coffin's theology has almost suddenly become consistent with that of his one-time adversaries; indeed, he seems to have been deeply impressed with the so-called "theology of crisis," which is somewhat pathological in its nature. It scorns all Liberal tendencies. "The best preaching is damnation!" cries Coffin, who only yesterday was a Liberal man. That strange saying from him fits in with the idea, "To be a religious man is to be a torn, a discordant, a restless man." All enlightenment

and culture, looking to "the crown and fulfilment of humanity," is despised. Crisis theology separates man from man; and Dr. Coffin has separated himself from the greatest task that ever came to his gifted mind and hand.

Of Dr. William P. Merrill it may also be said he is through. He came close to liberality in many a struggle, but the stalwart Fundamentalists in the Presbyterian Church have reduced him to gentle pleas for everything but freedom.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church Bishop Francis J. McConnell has said that this whole business of Fundamentalism and freedom is a triviality. Though he must see what is going on in the Churches and the Legislatures, he is wordless on the violations of liberty, taking comfort and exercise in his ministry of the social gospel, which these days is having a hard time to preserve its vigor and hopefulness, and its spiritual potency, because its ultimate sources are not pure and its soul is not free.

It dawns on men that you cannot have a social gospel until you first have a gospel. A gospel to get anywhere must have its theology, —a framework of belief; otherwise it moves gelatinously. Fundamentalists scorn the idea

of social service and amelioration as a loathsome degeneracy. Modernists scorn almost equally fiercely the importance of theology. Both are wrong and impotent. There is in the Federal Council of Churches constant strife with many of its constituents who come from twenty-eight of the Protestant denominations. They object to the social program. As a matter of fact, the Council performs a magnificent service for the commonweal, and advances the unity of the churches in vast social, industrial, political, and international causes by applying to all problems the principles of brotherhood and justice. Yet it is only by the most adroit caution and avoidance of danger that it carries on and gets their support. The Council's affairs are in the skillful hands of men who know the psychology of Fundamentalism, including the President, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman. He is famous for never having failed to answer a question on any conceivable subject, in his daily column in the *New York Tribune*. He is a master in the technique of saying the right thing. In the matter of spiritual freedom, he keeps off difficult theological subjects, and pleads, "Not creeds, but religion!" Dr. Cadman is in spirit broad, but in doctrine Funda-

mentalist. Does he believe the "five points" are essential to salvation? He always preaches as if he does.

Dean Charles R. Brown, Congregationalist, of Yale Divinity School, is a noted practical preacher, but he never mentions religious liberty. His forte is the moral duties of man, touched with the unction and authority of biblical text and illustration. His sympathy all goes over to Fundamentalism.

Dr. J. Fort Newton has gone away from the theological freedom of his earlier Universalist connection—it is very strange—and become a preaching littérateur in a rich Episcopal Church in the suburbs of Philadelphia.

Willard L. Sperry, once a Rhodes Scholar, now dean of Harvard Divinity School, is by genius and training an outstanding freeman, but whether it be the inhibitions of office, the atmosphere of Boston, the restraints of culture, or the genial nature of the man, the voice which might be resonant for liberation is pleasant and practical, even erudite and eloquent. Like so many, he believes, it seems, that "unity" and "good feeling" are more important at present than freedom. It was Dean Sperry who said, after a tour of the Middle

West in 1924, that Fundamentalism was only a brush fire. It was beneath his notice.

Other men might be named, but it would be a diminishing catalogue of clerics who have chosen the easier if not the better part of "waiting on the Lord" to encompass the glorious liberty of the children of God. The Church has declined to the comfortable things of the world. The difference between a prophet and an evangel is that the evangel says it when it is safe.

In this day of crying opportunity there is not an outstanding man who is brave enough to take his ecclesiastical life in his hands, hazard his personal fortunes, and declare for Christ and freedom. Many men intimate it, but in their audible utterances they all keep safely within their Church law. Regularity in the institution is more sacred to them than loyalty to the truth.

In their extremity, the preachers began a new safety-pulpit era. They considered the case of Fosdick,—his attack on the intolerance of Fundamentalism and how it unchurched him. If the forces were strong enough to apostatize a personage like Fosdick, they could annihilate lesser men. This state of mind quickly

communicated itself to the Church press all over the United States. It felt the pulse, and lost heart. There is, in consequence, nothing more tepid and flaccid than the typical journal of Protestantism.

The saddest case was the *Christian Century* and its abject surrender. This journal makes an inter-denominational appeal though it is under the patronage of certain persons in the Disciples of Christ,—the so-called Campbellite Church. An editor never spoke more powerfully for religious freedom than Charles Clayton Morrison did in January of 1924, on the crisis in Protestantism. It was a smashing editorial, and it reverberated in every State in the Union. Then time took a year and a half out of the calendar, and many things pressed the modification of the *Century's* opinion. Angered Fundamentalists poured their epistolary wrath into its correspondence columns, and stopped their subscriptions. John T. Scopes was arrested and the Tennessee Bible law on the teaching of evolution came to court. The Protestant Church of the country had become, like a certain proud city, a state of mind. On July 2, 1925, the *Christian Century* published a two-page virtual recantation. It now

upheld the proposition that "freedom is an anachronism." What yesterday was the soul of its being was repudiated and cast to the void. "The average man," said the Editor, "not only is not capable of perfect freedom in the individualistic sense, but he is not desirous of it . . . He hesitates to trust his own judgment and seeks the support of a higher authority . . . The authority of a personality alone is adequate . . . We may well despair of ever making a majority of men reasonable." The reader pauses to see if he reads aright. He does. He had thought that the foundation of America is the freedom of the individual, freedom to hold his opinion and freedom to speak it; that is what religion also demands. In social action he is governed willingly, freely, by the rule of a majority; in his thinking he is master of his soul without respect to others. This is the stand a man takes, and he bases it on the "authority" of Jesus who said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." What is truth, a man must himself decide. Jesus trusted men and called them brethren. That is why he is their leader. He did not belittle them and insult them by saying they could never become "reasonable."

How dare a Christian journal say men do not want freedom? How can it call itself American and utter such monarchic nonsense? How has it the face to affirm that a man and a Christian must have "superiors" in the Protestant Church who will tell him what he shall think? This paper was guilty of an unpardonable renunciation of the charter of Christianity itself. There is something more. The Editor admitted there were "inconsistencies" in the Churches, where the ministers have to "work with many minds and satisfy various religious needs." There are "two world views contending for mastery in the soul,"—the two worlds which had "crashed" and could not be reconciled, according to the former editorial. The ministers, with people of both "worlds" in the pews, we were told, accommodate themselves. "Sometimes the inconsistencies are deliberately chosen because inconsistency is regarded as preferable to impotence." One pauses, incredulous, at such an exhibition of "inconsistency" and asks, Could any impotence be worse than that which says one thing and believes another?

So this is Christianity!

More than any other influence, the *Christian*

University of Southern California Library

Century helped to save the day for Fundamentalism. It had the astuteness to speak the majority religious mind of America when it made its flop. Few persons stopped to inquire how this journal could be liberal, even radical, on social questions, and at the same time medieval and forbidding against the principle of spiritual freedom. That is because, in disputed religious matters, most people feel rather than think. Of course, the Editor is not a Fundamentalist in his heart. He is a Modernist with accommodation. This journal for June 16, 1927, prints a leading editorial on "Fading Fundamentalism." Believe it or not, there has never been any real trouble with Fundamentalism! The Editor says so. "This state of affairs has come to be known, in the press and by the public generally," he admits, "as a struggle between Fundamentalists and Modernists." He continues, "As a matter of fact, it has hardly been that at all. There has never been a time when the members of any of these communions would permit themselves to be ranged under either of these labels." That is slightly forgetful. It was the same Editor who declared, when the crisis was new, that the Churches

might sing "Blest be the tie that binds" till doomsday but they could not bind "the two worlds of Modernism and Fundamentalism together." "There is a clash here," he said, "as profound as that between Christianity and Confucianism." But "inconsistencies" are to be expected.

It did not surprise one greatly when the Fundamentalists, flushed with their glorious victory over the Churches, their lines formed for political action, attracted allies whom the world had counted their foes. There was Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, for example. He is master of staccato, stabbing sentences when he is wroth. To the delight of the Fundamentalists he assailed, without due discrimination, the teachers of science for their alleged irreverence. It was the fashion of the hour. A great leader of the South, Dr. Edgar Young Mullins, reputed Modernist, and President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, was prevailed upon actually to go before the Legislature of Kentucky and virtually denounce those who believe in evolution. This episode is important because it represents not only the adaptation of a powerful theologian to the prevailing state of mind, but

the transition of Fundamentalism from its conquest of the Church to Fundamentalism laying siege against the State. Now we shall see another reason for the reproach of the lost leaders of Protestantism.

VII

THE MENACE OF A STATE CHURCH

IN the one hundred and fifty years of this Republic, there has been a steady degeneracy of religious independence. The proof is to be seen in the intolerant and organized demands made for the first time in American history upon one Legislature after another, by church leaders, not in one section only, but in every part of the land. There is hardly a State which has not been attacked. The Fundamentalist is not, as some believe, a Southern religious phenomenon. He is typical, innumerable, as large a part of Massachusetts and Minnesota as he is of Tennessee and Texas. A cross section of any State would show that America has a Fundamentalist mind.

If any one doubts that this mind is made up and that it boasts it is the majority religion of this country, and is highly resolved that it will rule, he has not read the newspapers and the magazines in recent years.

William Jennings Bryan, peerless and lamented Fundamentalist leader, brought the full power of his political experience to bear upon the establishment of a virtual state church. He triumphed. In convicting John T. Scopes of Tennessee, he crystallized a fact: *You can do what you please if you have the votes.* Lincoln in his First Inaugural said that we, the people, could amend our Constitution, lead a revolution against our Government, or even destroy it, if we cared to do so. Mr. Bryan sent a thrill of cheer to the hearts of the Fundamentalists in Kentucky in 1922. "The movement [against evolution in the schools] will sweep the country," he said. "We have all the Elijahs on our side." The religious forces held aloft their Bibles in Kentucky and elsewhere, and marched breast forward to the Legislature. The rest is history, though only the opening chapters have thus far been enacted.

As a foreword to that remarkable story, let the writer's position in this book be plain and unmistakable. I take no stand here on matters of belief. I have another purpose. I respect every man in his faith. I do not oppose fundamentalist doctrines. Reference to them

is only incidental. I do not espouse evolution nor defend evolutionists. I am not now interested in the claims of science. I do not dispute the legal right of Fundamentalists to make their sectarian dogma into a statute, ruling the whole people, as they have done in Tennessee. I make every fair allowance. One thing I maintain: When they make such a law they stultify religious liberty and ravish the soul of America, which was dedicated to freedom. They violate the principle of the separation of church and state. They use the political machinery to enforce a religious opinion. Because they are a majority, they cruelly suppress a minority. They establish a state religion and invest a Legislature with divine authority in this republic exactly as kings were invested with "divine right" over the faith of their subjects. They have set up, in all its spiritual meaning, a monarchy in the heart of a democracy. They are guilty of the betrayal of their leader, Jesus Christ; they are convicted of treason against their country, these United States. This is their condemnation.

Any cause may be set down in a few words. In Tennessee it is stated that it shall be "un-

lawful to teach [in the public schools] any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Bible." That clause, destined to be historic, joins religion with politics and establishes a grave and significant precedent. It makes the Bible the supreme law. Never, not even in the dark ages of Christendom, has there been worse arrogance and religious presumption against learning and liberty. Of course, Fundamentalists we have had with us always. But even in the early days of the Church there were wise men who saved her from *our* folly. When Augustine, nearly sixteen hundred years ago, was the great power, there was a Bible issue just as there is to-day. This Father, still venerated by the Roman Catholic Church, disposed of the case of the Fundamentalists in a manner that might well be taken as an example by their descendants. The question had to do with the formation of the earth and its place in the universe. That is, the subject belonged to the field of science, but there was a Biblical belief about it that many of the people accepted. Astronomy and geology were involved. The Fundamentalists believed the earth was flat; that it was created in six days

It Is the Law!

Following is the full text of Tennessee's pro-Bible statute, concerning which the justices of the State Supreme Court registered a bewildering opinion, yet confirmed it as sound law:

An Act prohibiting the teaching of the Evolution Theory in all the universities, normals, and all other public schools of Tennessee, which are supported in whole or in part by the public-school funds of the State, and to provide penalties for the violations thereof.

Section 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee,* That it shall be unlawful for any teacher in any of the universities, normals, and all other public schools of the State which are supported in whole or in part by the public-school funds of the State, to teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.

Section 2. *Be it further enacted,* That any teacher found guilty of the violation of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not less than One Hundred Dollars ($100) nor more than Five Hundred Dollars ($500) for each offense.

Section 3. *Be it further enacted,* That this Act take effect from and after its passage, the public welfare requiring it.

Passed March 13, 1925.

and was the center of all worlds. The Bible said so.

How much Augustine helped to win the victory for science and freedom we cannot tell, but he laid down a principle that is sound for all time. He said, "It very often happens that there is some question as to the earth or the sky, or the other elements of the world, respecting which one who is not a Christian has knowledge derived from most certain reasoning and observation: and it is very disgraceful and mischievous, and of all things to be carefully avoided, that a Christian, speaking of such matters *as being according to the Christian Scriptures,* should be heard talking such nonsense that one perceiving him to be as wide of the mark as east from west can hardly restrain himself from laughing." [Italics ours.]

Our Fundamentalists—it is no mirthful occasion—have nullified the great churchman's principle of the separation of religion and science; and that other principle, sacred to a democracy, the separation of church and state. Some one has said the university professor of biology in a fundamentalist State like Tennessee or Texas is expected to teach instead

the theology of a certain majority group of church people. He must teach his subject according to Genesis for that is the required basis on the creation of man! And nothing that varies from the story in the Bible may be taught by him. Even in Augustine's era it was uncertain what Genesis really taught. He said, in 400 A.D., "When one shall say, 'Moses meant as I do,' and another, 'Nay, but he meant as I do,' I think I am speaking more religiously when I say, 'Why not rather as both, if both be true? And if there be a third truth or a fourth and if any seek a truth altogether different in these words he should be encouraged.'" Our Fundamentalist holds no such moderating opinion. He assumes that he is right and all others are wrong. He passes a law in Tennessee and adopts school regulations elsewhere, creating, in effect, an established church in the state. That church asks the state to enforce upon the teachers of the university and all the public schools "a definite doctrine in regard to the Bible and its interpretation." Here is the point of flagrant attack upon our civil and religious liberty. It makes a state religion a fact.

"An established religion," in the definition

of William Seagle, "is one which the State recognizes and prefers to all others." The Fundamentalists in the various denominations have prevailed over "all other" religions, not only in their churches but also in the Legislature. Their dogma has become a statute. A virtual state church has thus arisen, composed of many sects united in a single purpose. But a state church belongs to a monarchy, and never to a democracy. The basic factor in a monarchic state is not the King or Emperor, but the spiritual dogma that divine right resides in a ruler. The principle is prior to the person. The real foundation of every government is not political but spiritual. The spiritual idea is incarnated in the monarch as head of the church. When democracy came, it changed the whole conception of religion. A democracy is also spiritual in its foundation, but its theory is different. It believes in no spiritual revelation to a person and thus in no peculiar privilege. It has no state church. Not the divine right of kings but the dedication of the people to mutual service is the test. But with the rising tide of Fundamentalism the Legislature has assumed divine authority just as the King and Emperor once did, and

wherever it has made dogma law it has overturned our democracy.

It is very important for one to understand that this reversion is due to a sectarian, dogmatic crusade to make a certain view of the Bible the law of the land. It is a program of religious domination by state legislation. The notion prevails that the law now on the books in Tennessee and Mississippi, and the public-school regulations in five other states, which have the effect of law, are in opposition to science. That is a misunderstanding. In fairness to the Fundamentalists, let the reader know the facts. The law is primarily not a negative but a positive law. It is *for* the supreme authority of the Bible; it is *against* evolution merely as a definite object to make the battle for biblical infallibility victorious. Tennessee illustrates the truth. The text of the law says it is unlawful for one to teach in the public schools, including the normal schools and the State university, "any theory that denies the divine creation of man *as taught in the Bible.*" [Our italics.] Evolution, as it pertains to the creation of man, is one phase of modern learning—there are many others—which, according to the Fundamentalists, vio-

lates the Book. They defend the Scripture. The issue is not evolution. The issue is the Bible.

Within the compass of this chapter it is possible to deal in detail with only a few of the outstanding legislative events of these last years. At least twenty-two states have been waging this battle of religious authority against religious freedom, and in each state there is a dramatic story. In all of them the religious motive controls the situation. The fighting forces are the ministers of the Fundamentalist churches of the various denominations, and the victories are all counted as triumphs of the faith once delivered to the saints. Mississippi's law in this respect matches that of Tennessee in its intent. In Florida, where the controversy continues over to the next session of the Legislature after a drawn battle in 1927, the first stand was taken in 1923, in a resolution by the Legislature against teaching "any hypothesis that links man in blood relationship to any form of life," because the public schools should be "free from teachings designed to attack the religious beliefs of the public." The State Text-book Commission of Texas has required the pub-

lishers to eliminate references to evolution. Governor Miriam A. Ferguson said in 1925, "I am a Christian mother, and I am not going to let that kind of rot go into Texas text-books." Her successor, Governor Dan A. Moody, follows through in the same strain. North Carolina is not content with "expurgated" school-books,—a regulation since 1924. The Fundamentalists in that State are now pressing a law—the severest one on record—that will make it a crime to teach not only evolution, but any subject "in such manner as to contradict the fundamental truth of the Holy Bible." In Louisiana evolution has been deleted from all the books on the same dogmatic ground. Oklahoma voted against alleged anti-Bible teaching in 1923, and since then it has been agitated by controversy. A popular referendum in 1926 voted the law down, but the governor, a Fundamentalist, said the people did not know what they were doing, and the end is not yet. Dr. W. B. Riley, chief Fundamentalist in the country today, led a campaign in his State, Minnesota, in 1927, which almost carried the Legislature and would have done so if the churches had been as well organized as they were zealous for

what they conceive to be the salvation of their people. Adventists and Baptists in New England carried the issue to the Legislative halls of New Hampshire, where it was defeated after a skirmish led against it by President Ernest M. Hopkins of Dartmouth College; and in Maine there was a foray by Fundamentalists for Bible legislation that did not get far because it was poorly managed.

Many persons regarded the conviction of John T. Scopes for violation of the Tennessee pro-Bible law as a bit of rustic buffoonery. They simply would not believe that a man could be adjudged guilty of a crime for teaching "any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Bible." But it was done. The lower court convicted him and fined him, and if he had let the case rest there and not paid the fine, he would have gone to a felon's cell—in the year of our Lord, 1925! When an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Tennessee, lawyers said there would be no question of a reversal of such a fool law and silly lower-court decision. But they were wrong. It is true the Supreme Court did reverse the verdict against Scopes so far as the fine of $100 was concerned, but

that was because the lower court erred in going beyond the legal limit of a $50 fine. The higher court also non-prossed the case, on the ground that Scopes was no longer an employee of the State (he had gone meanwhile to the University of Chicago). The effect was to prevent a further appeal to the United States Supreme Court, with the inevitable unfavorable reflection on Tennessee's intellectual barbarism. But this most learned court, composed, it is to be presumed, of the best jurists in Tennessee (all five of whom are credited with being Fundamentalists), found in the pro-Bible law no conflict with the guaranteed rights of individuals under the constitutions of Tennessee and of the United States. It is not a denial, said the Court, of the provision "that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship," for the denial or affirmation of such a theory does not enter into any recognized mode of worship. Nor is it an "exercise of the police power of the State undertaking to regulate the conduct of individuals in their dealings with each other. It is simply "an act of the State as a corporation, a proprietor, an employer. It is a declaration of a master as to

the character of work the master's servant shall, or rather, shall not perform." At the same time, the majority opinion seems to deplore the presence of the statute, though it does not judge it, as the *Independent* said editorially. "The jurists suggest that if prohibiting instruction in evolution renders the teaching of biology no longer desirable, 'this course of study may be entirely omitted from the curriculum of our schools.'" The Court concludes laconically, "If this be regarded as a misfortune, it must be charged to the Legislature, which passed the pro-Bible law."

Such a course of reasoning, it is believed, would be followed generally in the states, and it gives weight to the conclusion that in a question confined to spiritual and personal liberty, where the issue of property is not involved, there is no relief in the law. The Oregon law against the continuance of private schools, which was sustained in the State Court, was reversed in the United States Supreme Court because it did involve private property. The outcome in Tennessee is probably typical, and a likely precedent in other cases.

John T. Scopes says of the significance of the movement, North, South, East and West:

"Religious intolerance is to-day one of our controlling factors in daily life. One of my friends told me recently that he would be appointed an instructor in a State institution but only if he joined a certain church. Religious intolerance is with us, as is shown by the various laws that have been passed by our various State Legislatures, and by the attempts to pass others."

Whenever it becomes the law of a state that one belief shall be taught and another belief, as in the case of evolution, shall be silenced and suppressed, there is not only an encroachment on religious liberty by legislative action but also a state of mind which makes the encroachment of the law possible; and the latter fact is, of course, the greater danger. Even if there should be no more Bible legislation, we should still have the dogmatic spirit ruling religion.

No genuine American would silence the Fundamentalist. To do so would be to commit the same spiritual and democratic blunder that now curses the country. It is wrong to be intolerant of the belief of any man. It is right and necessary to speak in defense of the destiny of the Nation. Religion is an indis-

soluble part of every great national movement. The great spiritual force which brought into being, and upon the foundation of which rests the very structure of America, has been recognized by our leaders from Washington to the present. President Coolidge is constantly saying with his Puritan incisiveness that this country is spiritual or it is nothing. The Fundamentalists who have had their way in Tennessee and many other states would be violent in their attacks if the Roman Catholics tried to gain the control of the Government. These apostate Protestants do not see their own sin is doing as much against the Nation as they ever charged the Catholics with aiming to do.

The doctrine which ought to be preached in every pulpit, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, and on every corner, is that the spiritual belief of the individual must have unrestricted freedom for its natural development and its own form of expression, because, for one thing, sincere religious conviction is the vital element in political progress. The denial of both the principle and the practice of religious liberty, and not any theories about religion, is the greater crime in this day, for without such

liberty, America, as we know it, could not exist and cannot survive.

It is because we have Fundamentalist hearts in America that we have Fundamentalist laws, and only when we get a new birth of freedom in the churches shall we also get a new deliverance from these legal bonds. The religious trouble of the day, as the *Baltimore Evening Sun,* one of our ablest and most honorable journals, has said, "is actually an affair of religion, rather than of politics." That is, "The spirit of intolerance is not the fault of our laws, organic or statute, but the fault of some of our churches . . . The sort of religion that prevails in some parts of America to-day is the inveterate foe of human liberty."

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

VIII

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN POLITICS

TO keep religion and politics in separate compartments is impossible. History proves that, and we know it from our every-day experience. Name any State institution affecting human welfare, and one will find it had its origin in part at least in the religious zeal of the people. Religion furnished much of the force for the abolition of slavery, it gave impetus to the public education of childhood, it brought to pass the prohibition of alcoholic drink, and it still strives to release children from the cruel bondage of toil. The ideas of the Christian religion blasted the foundation of imperial Rome, and led forth a new civilization. To-day, after one hundred years of Christian missions, China is awake and in revolution in the spirit of 1776. As Yuan Shih Kai said to a Methodist missionary, "Do you think it possible to preach in a country like this a gospel like yours, of justice and love and

brotherhood, and not have some day a revolution?" The problem is, How can religion exert its influence in politics without uniting the Church and the State? We are a simple-minded, optimistic people, and we have naïvely thought we were resolving this age-long problem without any difficulty. But the Fundamentalists came and we had to face the stark fact that quite as much as in a monarchy this democracy of ours has permitted, in principle, at least, the union of the two basic institutions, and we seem as far from an answer to our question, in both theory and practice, as our fathers were before us. It is true men speak with apparent sureness of the matter, but always in hazy general terms. They say the Church should be a spiritual leaven but never a political lever. As a matter of fact, it is both, and it will continue to be both. There has never been a time since organized government began when religion or the Church has been separate from or morally inactive in the State. On the other hand, no greater danger can befall either Church or State than the use of direct political action by organized religion instead of its propagation of spiritual principles. Holy wars tell the baneful story.

In order to clear the ground, let there be some consideration of the nature of the State. In theory, the Western world has regarded the State as secular. The Church, we have said, has to do with the otherworld and the future life. Of course, we have not lived up (or down) to our theory. But otherworldliness has been the idea. The State tolerates religion, as W. E. Hocking says, on condition that religion let politics severely alone. That also is mostly unpracticed theory. Religion has never let politics alone. The theory is untenable because it is impracticable. Both State and Church must have a constant relation of interdependence.

"The State needs religion because it cannot be indifferent to the mental springs of its own vitality . . . Religion in turn requires the political life; it derives from the State force and actuality for the ends which the god is felt to will . . . Without the State, religion is empty; without religion the State is blind, anemic, incohesive. Religion and politics together constitute a functional unity for the will to power: the will demands both circuits for the normal round of life." That is Hock-

ing's philosophy of religion and politics. He calls it the "principle of alternation." Religion, or worship, is the *back* stroke, by which the self is given a new grasp on reality, gathers a new sense of worth, in fine, is recreated and revitalized. The political life "ministers to the will in the *out* stroke, the application of its energy, its formulation of policies of conduct, and its concrete realization of character." The back stroke and the out stroke belong together for the work of the State.

This conception is in harmony with the idea of an English statesman and publicist, Lionel Curtis, who has actually helped to re-form states, in India, South Africa, and Ireland. "In the last analysis states are united not by self-interest but by moral ideas. Their foundations are laid, not in the flesh, but in the spirit of men." It follows that the sentiment which unites men in common loyalty is mystical and the motive of obedience to the State is religious. "Only in so far as citizens are willing to sacrifice themselves," he says, "can States exist. Compact is no more the basis of a State than settlements of property are the basis of marriage. The ultimate bond

of the State is sacramental, or, to use the words of President Lincoln, is in the nature of dedication."

Dedication to *what?* That is the question. A monarchy is in theory just as religious as a democracy, but we think it is not as good. There is a reason. King David's commands, they said, were divinely inspired. When the present king of England visited India as its emperor he was treated by vast multitudes with a veneration which showed that they regarded his authority as divine. Lionel Curtis tells us he saw a letter to the government from a powerful notable in India at the time of the reforms, in which he said: "I do not understand the meaning of these proposals to transfer the King's authority to a public assembly. I have always obeyed His Majesty because I believed that he was the representative of God. I wish to be told where I am." Through the centuries this theory has been undergoing modification, but at bottom it still holds in every state ruled by king or emperor. We do not believe President Coolidge's policies—nor any other President's—come down from God in heaven. Our ruler is not clothed with divine authority. To men under the kingly

state of society, the orders are held to be inspired by divine wisdom; in our State, the orders are regarded as the product of human intelligence. The people decide their worth. With us, the real bond which unites society is not fear of God but the duty which men owe each other. This is the requirement of Jesus himself, who taught that by showing love to our neighbor we prove our love of God. In a democracy there is not less of the law of God but more of the service of man.

We believe that the transition from autocracy to democracy began when men learned "to interpret their duty to God in terms of duty to their neighbor." That is the greatest dividing line in the history of civilization. The most remarkable example of the old order is Moses. He represented the principle of authority, and thus of monarchy. He went up to Mount Sinai and brought down the two tables of the law. He thundered the commandments which he said he had received from God directly and exclusively, and the people in fear obeyed. They were his subjects. Jesus had a more excellent way. He came to Galilee with the strong and gentle proposition that men love one another. It was not a command

but an appeal to men. That day democracy was born.

These two religious ideas have been contending down the corridors of time. Men and nations rise and fall on account of them. The Great War was fought over them. It was "to make the world safe for democracy" that we entered the conflict. Only freemen in religion could give their lives for freedom in politics. Among the citizens in a democracy there are still men who are at heart more monarchic than democratic,—men unworthy of their state. Their religious theory has been taken over from their dogmatic churches into their social and political practice. When Alexander Hamilton opposed Thomas Jefferson the real issue was religion. That is, Jefferson was a thoroughgoing believer in the idea of Jesus that God created men free and equal, in rights and opportunities. Men were to be regarded as brethren. Hamilton, on the other hand, was an aristocrat because he was an adherent of the Established Church of England, which believed and still believes in its superior order of clergy and people. Jefferson was an avowed free churchman. He had a "certain mystic faith in the rectitude of

human impulse." He genuinely believed in the people. Trust them and train them, he said. Hamilton despised common folk. He loathed the idea of plain people ruling this country. He strongly favored government by modified monarchy. In his case, as in Jefferson's, it was simply and inevitably his religion applied to politics, his church's theory at work in the State. And so it may be said of either individuals or of groups that their religion and their politics are inseparable. If you know a man's inner religion, you know his politics.

Certain pertinent conclusions come now. It will be said that the rise of a virtual state church in this country is due to the lack of free religion. That is precisely true. If you have a dogmatic belief in religion, you will have, if you can, a domineering attitude in the State. The Fundamentalist majority in Tennessee illustrates. It is because we have had in all the creedal churches certain binding beliefs, and, as it were, the divine authority of them, that we now see a united front against the rights of man in the Legislatures. If one is free, one is free in all things; if one is authoritarian, one is authoritarian in all things.

The majority religion of America is Fundamentalist, and the majority vote in our Legislatures, it may be found, is Fundamentalist. Fundamentalism is monarchist in both theory and practice. It is alien to America. In other words, we have in Fundamentalism a vast majority of people called Protestant who do not believe the Protestant theory of freedom in religion, and that is why they do not believe the American theory of freedom in politics. The sons of Hamilton are with us still. So are the sons of Jefferson.

Men who remember that Jefferson predominated in the spiritual founding of America say, "But do not forget that the Constitution guarantees our liberty. Look at the Bill of Rights,—'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'" What does that mean? It sounds like a "great altruistic, disinterested, and gratuitous declaration of natural and inalienable human rights," as William Seagle says. The truth is, most of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention demanded the prohibition contained in the amendment because they desired to insure freedom from interference within their own

religious creeds and sects. They wanted to be let alone. They also dreaded that "the Federal Government, if left untrammeled, might set up a Goddess of Reason [as in France], or recognize the temporal power of the Pope, or revert to Mosaism." They knew the political force of religion. Those men were made of human nature as we are, and they had a great deal more sagacity than some of us.

Lawyers also like to cite that part of Article VI, of the Constitution, which says, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." They think they cover the problem of every man in his liberty. But in fact they do nothing of the kind. The real intent here was not to vouchsafe spiritual independence to everybody. It was to keep the State from creating an established religion. That was the danger in those early days. They provided in effect that a candidate for public office must not be required to pass an examination and qualify in certain authorized religious doctrines. There must be no official American Church. That would injure all the others.

Of course, any intelligent person knows that in actual affairs Article VI is violated in every

part of the country. A man's particular religion does help or hurt him, especially if he professes a minority belief. On indicating his receptive attitude to the Presidency, Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York, quickly learned the mind of a large part of the country. William H. Taft lost thousands of votes because of his church affiliation. Any Jewish candidate for office will bear lively witness that religion counts. The reality of the matter is that neither by Constitution, nor by legislation, nor by judicial decision can any such grace as liberty be imputed to man. Liberty is a gift of the spirit. Some of our Fathers had the spirit. That is why liberty entered into the law. When liberty is no longer in the soul of man it is dead in the law. Are we still young for liberty?

You cannot put an effectual and durable guarantee of a man's liberty into law, for the reason that liberty, being spiritual, can be acquired only by spiritual means. The law has no effect over the heart. You can guarantee a man's property rights by the force of law, but you can preserve his freedom of soul only by the spirit of free and tolerant religion. In other words, religious liberty can not be created

by legislation or any such thing, but it may be destroyed or at least impaired by legislation. We Americans have in fact been confronted with such a calamity. The guilt lies at the door of the Church. The Church is and has ever been the custodian and purveyor of the things of the Spirit. The Church, though officially separate and self-sustaining, by its teaching of its members supplies the State indirectly but effectually with its religious ideas and ideals, among which liberty ought to be cardinal.

By the very nature of its task the Church is a power in political institutions, for its purpose has been not the keeping of a private sect but the advancement of civilization. In that emprise, identity of Church and State, we have learned by experience, was bad for religion and politics, because it standardized both and they became, as they say of the church, "established," which means static and fixed, incapable of progress. In all ages we have seen that religion has been in some degree a controlling factor in public affairs. In the thirteenth century the missionary effort among the surrounding peoples was quite indistinguishable from the Church's work of so-

cial reconstruction, and the relation has never been severed. In the modern conception it has been the Church's chief business to exercise its influence not by political pretension and activity but by preaching and teaching. Yet we see that the theoretical separation of Church and State has not diminished the need of vigilance lest one church or another gain the ascendancy in political affairs. Two explicit counsels on this subject of religion and politics are timely and imperative. The first is that the State is spiritual, and politics is nothing less than living spiritually for the State. The second is that religion must be free. A church or group of churches which maintains that it has all religious truth, or even one religious truth that must be the law of the whole people, will inevitably assume that cast of mind and think it has all political truth, as it has done in Tennessee and many other States.

It is a condign rebuke against many ministers of our churches that they have been contributing to a condition in our common life which is as destructive as the act of a traitor would be in leading his country's forces into the hands of the enemy in time of war. They

have piously sold us out and put us under monarchic law. In the churches they have taught their people, including the plastic minds of children, religious ideas of human authority in book or creed which have produced submissive creatures. They have gone out from worship and up to the Legislature there intolerantly to apply their religion by taking away the sacred right of freedom of opinion from all those who differ from their dominating majority. That which enters into a man goes out of a man! In Hocking's words, the back stroke and the out stroke are interdependent. Or, in childhood's saying, "What goes up, must come down." The minister may find a lesson in the sixteenth century. He must take his place, like every great church leader in the past, as a public servant. His church, of whatever denomination, has no right to be a miserable little sect revolving in its private orbit, nor one unit in a Fundamentalist tyranny. The true church is not a chapel in the byway, its people insulated from the rest of the community. By the very necessity of the social order they join all the other citizens on the highway, where they contribute their beings to the common river of life. Their

spiritual ideals either pollute the stream or purify it that all may drink and live in liberty. And those recreant Modernist ministers, who by their silence give their consent to this imposition of a state church, will remember that there is biblical warrant for severe judgment for such as they.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that we Americans believe with all our heart that one may not be a monarchist in religion and a democrat in politics. By monarchist in religion we mean one who submits to the spiritual authority of the Church in defense of a Bible infallible in all its parts. The Church thus assumes divine right over all moral and spiritual affairs, including their application to the State. It teaches that if there is a conflict between a dogma of the Church and a law of the State, the State is in error, and obedience in that case belongs to the Church. The Church is above the State. It is divine and final. That is Fundamentalism. That is Tennessee.

A monarchist in religion becomes something different from and less than a democrat in politics. A democrat in politics is his own authority as to truth and error, spiritual and political. He submits to majority rule as a

practical expedient, but he does not surrender his minority opinion. He not only keeps himself free but he vouchsafes freedom to men of every faith. He believes a state church will not stand in the United States. This Nation cannot be half monarchist and half free as it could not be half slave and half free.

IX

OUR CONTINUING INTOLERANCE

LORD BRYCE, who knew this country better than any foreign statesman except De Tocqueville, would not say, if he were living to-day, that intolerance has "largely disappeared from American life." Forty years ago Bryce declared that "in no imaginable future is there likely to be any attempt to repress either by law or by opinion the free exercise of speculative thought on morals, on religion, and, indeed, in every matter not within the immediate range of politics." Could Bryce have been more thoroughly wrong in his generous judgment of the spirit and action of the American commonwealth? Not only has the country suffered in many parts the virtual establishment of a state-sanctioned religion, thus bringing a presumably private and sacred matter within the range and dominance of politics, but it has accepted the argument that the tradition of the country, from colonial

days, makes this not only a Christian but a Protestant Nation.

The reasoning is true! From the time of the New England theocracies to the legalized state church in Tennessee, the creed-bound Protestant has made his theology powerful over the government. The unfailing strain, from the original Puritan to the present-day Ku Kluxer, is hostile to Christian Liberal and Roman Catholic, to Negro and Jew. One reads the records of the Constitutional Convention, and finds the most striking fears and hatreds toward all kinds of believers who were at variance with the majority Calvinism that put iron in the blood of the creedal colonials. They have never been budged from their supremacy in any part of the land; and they have never relaxed their indomitable assurance that it is God's will that they believe as they please and make everybody else believe likewise, under penalty of the law. Having now the voting strength, they have their way in both the letter and the spirit.

Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, the distinguished president of the Johns Hopkins University, tells us that from the beginning we Americans have been an intolerant people. This may be

the home of the brave, but hardly the land of the free. The founders were exceedingly assertive of themselves. They had reacted not unnaturally from the age-long tyranny of kings. Their new-won freedom gave them an exceeding sense of individual worth. Each man was for himself. Individualism grew by what it fed upon, until hard unloveliness of character, with a certain admirable initiative and honesty, overspread New England and is to be found in many sections to this day.

It is trite to any one who reads our history that intolerance has given the cast of mind to our institutions. The strong fathers have transmitted to their sons the biblical idea (as interpreted by them) that they are their brothers' keepers, and that is why there is more wet-nursing and gum-shoeing in the United States than in any other country on the planet. We are, on that account, the slaves of a morality that pains us and makes everybody else unhappy. Our codes, as much in the Sunday schools as in the courts, are, on the whole, punishments to restrain, rather than precepts to inspire. Control of others' conduct takes precedence over coöperation for common ideal ends, and only in a crisis that threatens our

whole national life in catastrophe, for example, the Great War, do we have the least desire to build together a stately mansion for a beautiful, harmonious, and intelligent life. The most sacred words in America are not freedom and service, but law and order. Not the prophet, the poet, or the pioneer, but the policeman is the symbol of our civilization.

The present religio-political condition is in no wise a new phenomenon. Literally and historically, it has been coming to us. How we got this way is a plain story that Alexis De Tocqueville warned us about a hundred years ago. He wrote in 1830, that there was no country in which there was "less independence of thought and less real liberty of discussion than in America." Even thus early he saw what brilliant minds of our own day, such as Walter Lippmann, are protesting against with vigor. There has grown up a sanctity of the majority that would rule over matters of private judgment and spiritual belief, and leave to the individual, at last, no field whatever in which to create ideas and initiate action. Apologists for the majority, says Mr. Lippmann, have argued "that by some mysterious process the opinion to which a majority sub-

scribes is true and righteous," and they "ascribe to the majority of voters the same supernatural excellence which had always adhered to traditional rulers," when kings were kings by the grace of God. De Tocqueville said the same thing a century ago: "The majority draws a formidable circle around thought. Within its limits the writer is free, but woe unto him if he crosses them. He will be subject to all sorts of persecution." A true bill against Fundamentalism! Has it not fulfilled the description of both the wise Frenchman and the brilliant journalist? The pro-Bible law is based on the theory of the "supernatural" perfection of the Fundamentalist version of the Book; and all those outside the "circle of thought" are subjected, if not to persecution, at any rate to civic disabilities.

It is extraordinary that, for all our talk about intolerance, we do not get on with it. As Mark Twain said about the weather, everybody complains, but nobody does anything. A student pursuing the subject of tolerance among ancient and contemporary writers, comes back almost empty-handed. Has anything clear, precise, and practicable, anything that makes an intelligent case for tolerance

ever been said by the wisdom of man? If so, who said it? Tolerance is the most elusive subject in the field of ethics. Does it, as a matter of fact, belong to ethics? Usually the spiritual leaders take it as appertaining to their mystical vocation. Nobody has said less that really counts on tolerance than Phillips Brooks, who wrote at length all around it. He feels after the thing but he nowhere puts it into definite terms that have intellectual respectability.

After a long quest, it is one man's conviction that tolerance by itself is not a true principle, either as an abstract proposition or as a workable guide in actual life. Perhaps it were nearer the truth to say tolerance is only half of a principle. *The will to let live,* which many would call tolerance, is, taken by itself, an unreality, and it will always remain an unreality in the individual or the group, in religion or politics, in church or state. For satisfying results the other half of the principle, *the will to live,* must always be present. Tolerance by itself is a species of non-resistance, without positive power, tepid and neutral. To be tolerant only, counts for nothing and worse than nothing. A tolerant is a flat, unprofitable person. Soon or late he

comes to have no convictions in religion or anything else. He is like Lyman Abbott's complacent man in the hospital, who had lost both feet. He was still serene. Everything was all right. "They were cold anyhow," he said.

A person who is above all things tolerant never did any service for mankind. If he keeps at it, he is put in servitude. The Negro is just beginning to note the difference between his race and the Indian. The Negro submitted. He was tolerant. So they made him a slave. There are many white slaves male and female. But the Red Man was proud. He fought and died rather than yield. His honor was in his intolerance of human conquest. Our own independent country would never have been if the colonial people had endured the wrongs of England. Tolerance not only destroys one who practices it, but breeds intolerance in those who exploit him and have their own predominant way. It is not a mere personal negative weakness for one to be tolerant; it is a social menace. How the ecclesiastics and likewise the politicians of every age have kept the people tolerant! When the time comes they mass them in church and state and make them in-

tolerant robots as they have done in the present crisis.

Tolerance thus passes over into the very quality of which it is the antithesis. This is a paradox not more striking than that other,—of love becoming hate. Tolerance in itself alone is hardly less vicious than intolerance. Neither can abide alone. Both are futile. That is what America has yet to learn. No teaching by Jesus, no immortal example of our country, extols tolerance as a virtue standing by itself. The attempt has been made by Ida M. Tarbell to make Lincoln the great tolerant. Was he? "Take his attitude," she says, "toward those who upheld slavery . . . He refused to hate the people who thought slavery was right. He said, 'Thinking it right, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? *Can we cast our votes with their view and against our own?*' [Italics ours.] He could not and would not do that; but he could not and would not despise and abuse them because they did not yield to him." And Miss Tarbell calls that tolerance. Could anything, really, be more absurd? Lincoln, it is true, did not hate, abuse, or despise

these people, because it would have been brutal to them and barbarous to his own nature. But what did he do? He used all the persuasive power of the Constitution and the law, he set all the might of an organized state in motion to abolish slavery; and when these failed he sent armies, and those who kept slaves *did* yield. If he was kind toward those whose ideas and possessions were destroyed, he nevertheless destroyed their ideas and possessions, and, as to slavery, he was the most intolerant man in American history up to that time.

Was there anything that Jesus conceived to be wrong that he yet tolerated?

"The moment it abates, by one whisper, its intolerant idealism," says Don Marquis, "Christianity ceases to exist; it becomes something else; it is absolute, or it is nothing; it cannot make terms or it defeats itself; it can pardon all sinners, but never any sin; its most mild-seeming precepts are really explosive paradoxes; it is nothing to be trifled with. . . . Most of the troubles of the world, since it appeared, have been stirred up in one way or another by the action of this idealism on the human spirit; people who are touched with it

may and do compromise, but the thing itself does not compromise."

Christianity, when true to itself, has never been an attitude of noninterference with any man's convictions or doings. For it to be passive would be to fly in the face of human nature, and to thwart the advancement of civilization. "As soon as the interests of one man encounter the interests of another man, tolerance is challenged," says Beryl Cohon, "and if these interests be vital, tolerance is put in the background." In other words, the only thing one rightly tolerates is a triviality. The best representatives of tolerance are the mollusca and the feeble-minded.

Tolerance, as ordinarily understood, the more it is pressed, the more intolerant it becomes, and one of the most amusing things on this sphere is the behavior of human beings called "liberals" who as a rule are only faintly interested in any great cause, but become aroused lividly when their darling tolerance is in jeopardy.

As a theory, though not so much as a practice, tolerance is probably a product of our American temper and our complex popula-

tion. Wilbur C. Abbott praises tolerance for its disinclination to persecute, its hospitality to other people's opinion; but the obtuseness of tolerance to abuses, under the guise of "liberal" and "broad-minded" sentiments that are gravely harmful to our spiritual principles of life, is a sloppiness and vice that endures many things that ought to be intolerable. Good nature, and the fear of arousing animosities, pass for tolerance, and we virtuously suffer evils that we ought to resent and destroy. It is easy for one to claim as tolerance what is really a lack of moral sense and distinction. Alice Meynell knows the kind. She causes the modern Publican to say,—

"For I am tolerant, generous, keep no rules,
And the age honors me."

He makes no pretension of any standards or obligations, and becomes, in fact, in his pride of this attitude, a new type of Pharisee whom he scorns,—

"Thank God, I am not as these rigid fools,
Even as this Pharisee."

And so he is tolerant!

OUR CONTINUING INTOLERANCE

Does not the world need a new word for that which is so poorly described as tolerance? Neither in theory nor in practice does that term longer fit. It is not necessary, in our conduct of life, to choose between bigotry and flabbiness, as Tennyson once said. But was not George Tyrrell nearly accurate in observing at the end of his life that tolerance was the withering of the outer branches of religious conviction, a warning that vital faith was dead in its trunk and at its roots? There must be no acquiescing by a man in the thing he does not believe is true, for if he does, says Willard L. Sperry, he has "the blood guilt of his supine silence."

Beside the new word—who will give it?—there must be the reality of conduct which the word describes. Something has gone wrong not only with our theory, but with intolerance in fact, because a great majority has arisen angrily to enforce by legislation beliefs in opposition to the precious private soul-possessions of hundreds of thousands of enlightened people. Instead of trusting to the power of persuasion, the church has dragooned the state into policing religion, which is in legal bonds.

What, then, is right in this matter? Neither

tolerance nor intolerance, but an open mind and good will must have the ascendancy, with convictions and the right to speak them and contend for them, and the same right vouchsafed to every other man. To close the mind to what others believe is to arrest knowledge and to be "satisfied with what we know, our intellectual curiosity gone, our ability to better our physical environment gone." To know the truth is a part of the struggle whose other name is life. Intelligence and good will, and the instinct of fair play,—these are the essentials. Discretion is a virtue, but tolerance *of itself alone,* never! It is at best a half truth, and, in behavior, as bad as a lie.

Three propositions are central. First, seek those things all people hold in common, such as liberty, brotherhood, love, and justice. Second, in whatever things there are distinctive and peculiar beliefs, let every man stand by his own openly, strongly, and without the least interference, and fight against any law repressing opinion. Third, let all keep the rules, in the free competition of ideas, each striving for victory, seeking what is the common good, and all sportsmanlike in victory or in defeat. That course is high above both

tolerance and intolerance, the will to live and the will to let live. It is the spirit of humanity. It is the love of mastery and of service. And though the churches have fallen short in their proper business, and in consequence the states have sadly lapsed, there is something stubbornly native to us which rebukes both church and state and declares we are greater than either and are yet going to have our way for a growing, better world wherein dwelleth liberty.

X

THEOLOGY, THE MAIN INGREDIENT

WHAT people expect of the Church and never get is peace. For most minds peace is the equivalent of tolerance. The principal cause of religious strife, they say, is theology. They hate theology. Religion is all right, but theology is of no use, is generally wrong, and the root of half our sorrows.

But what is theology? The answer is absurdly simple. It is nothing more or less than the orderly and systematic presentment of ideas about religion. People have all kinds of theology. In an intelligent world—or any world above that of savagery—the most important thing about religion is theology. The only people among us who do not seem to need theology are the vegetative saints, and they, as a matter of fact, have a theology. It makes them what they are. What one thinks about religion is one's theology. If one does

not think, one has no religion. Theology is indispensable. Without clear metaphysical ideas undergirding and overarching this vast humanity of ours, life would be a jumble of fortuities. As much as ethics, or feeling, or esthetics, or mysticism, does theology contribute to the complex whole which is religion.

Religion always we have with us, almost, one may say, as the center rather than a side of life. And it is true also of theology. He little knows his own spiritual nature or the history of religion who would silence theology and keep religion for a private possession. First of all, it cannot be done. Beginning with doctrine, and striving always, either directly or indirectly, to make that doctrine the prevailing rule of action, the Church is the most practical of human institutions, as it has always been. Of the influence of theology on disputed public questions we need but say "Evolution," "K. K. K.," "Mexico," "Prohibition," "Governor Smith and the Presidency," "Luther Burbank," the "Interchurch Steel Report," "Humanism," to realize that these terms are in part symbols of vital religious thought and movement. There are sure to be differences of opinion about the metaphysical foundations

of life; it is these which constitute religion, and the definition of them which constitutes theology. But in all fields of human thought, even the most precisely scientific, there is unceasing controversy. Religion cannot escape the pains of progress. Only by this means, that is, by arguing openly for what we believe to be the truth, can we arouse public opinion, arrive at convictions, and give the world a push.

There could be no spiritual progress without all the elements of a man working together to make his religion. Theology is not only the most essential thing *about* religion; it is the main ingredient *in* religion.

What is needed is not less theology, but more theology of the right kind. Thomas Carlyle said of his father that "he was religious with the consent of all his faculties." The critical intelligence is as important as "the creative imagination, the keen-edged conscience, and the winged power of the soul." But among us, Carlyle's standards have collapsed. In our theological schools there is a conspiracy against man-size theology. A few exceptions there are among the two hundred Protestant theological institutions, but in general when a man is graduated, he has no decent

equipment for his generation in what ought to be the central study of his calling. Edward E. Slosson, eminent scientist and churchman, has it quite right: "The graduates are good fellows. They seem to be smartly up-to-date in all respects but one, and that is theology. Most of them do not seem to have any or any interest in any. . . . Your modern theological graduate has learned how to give the glad hand to the strangers at the church door, and can teach Boy Scouts how to salute the flag—things that a pump-handle or a drill sergeant could do as well—but he is not qualified to lead people through the mazes of modern thought." This is a time of the greatest revolution in thinking that the world has even seen and the leaders of Pan-Protestantism are theologically bankrupt. One consequence is that the Churches have made a disastrous capitulation to ignorance and intolerance.

Not any particular system of doctrine is the first need, but the habit of thinking about the fundamentals of faith and reason,—"about the metaphysics that lie at the basis of physics, the psychology that controls character and motivisation, the personal philosophy that is the compass of conduct." The new

knowledge which the preachers are not even trying to interpret is bound to influence the theology and philosophy, the religion and morals of the future. Subjects like "the constitution of the universe and the working of men's minds, that will keep up half the night students in engineering or biology," says Dr. Slosson, "leave theological students bored." They are outside the current of modern thought. There is no theological thinking. The Fundamentalist night-rider against spiritual freedom meets no resistance. The flourishing divinity schools are those of the Fundamentalists. Many of them are crowded. But it were ghastly travesty to speak of these products as professional men. They are bigots in bonds. They do no thinking. They are metallic-minded records. To think, one must be free and have something to think about. And in the seminaries which ought to be forward-looking, the fact is they teach every side issue and neglect the main thing—theology. They are afraid of it, and they are lazy. To pass from the old theology to the new would take onerous mental labor, it would shoot to pieces the fundamentalist system, and the preachers themselves would go up in the grand

explosion. In this whole land there is only one school of the prophets belonging to a creedal church that faces the new day. The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, nominally Baptist, does enjoy a degree of freedom and love of truth that leads it far ahead of most of the doddering institutions of American Protestantism. Theology is almost abandoned in such alleged liberal places as Harvard, Union, Yale, and Newton. The lesser schools follow their example. Several free church seminaries go seriously about their business of re-creating a theology suited to our day, but all the rest (Fundamentalist schools of course excepted) are giving courses in economics, psychology, social relations, Bible history and exegesis, church management, pastoral care, and are camouflaging the situation by belittling the one subject that gives a minister the rank and dignity of a professional person. What he does to-day anybody can do without special discipline.

Their teachers ought to point out to theological students the practical consequence of theology. They know that the Fundamentalist doctrinal issue began in a theological dogma about the infallible Bible and the cre-

ation of man, and that the historic controversy to-day in the Church is directly responsible for all of the repressive political action throughout the country. Our loss of religious liberty is due to nothing except our theology. A dogma has become a statute.

Julian Huxley, of the celebrated English family, views the astounding American scene, and after recovering from the shock, puts his precise finger upon the truth. He understands that one cannot get on in the business of living without religious beliefs. "Dogma in some form, theology in some form, is a necessary part of any developed religion. . . . A society without beliefs would be like an organism essaying motion on land without a skeleton—it would collapse gelatinously." It follows that "religion needs a definite intellectual framework for two reasons; in the first place, to guard it against doing wrong things; and in the second place, to help it to do right things. . . . An intellectual basis is needed for religion, because religion overflows into action, and because in the long run the qualities and values of actions are always determined by the correctness of the intellectual premises on which they are based." In other

words, Mr. Huxley is saying truth is always something to be done; nothing is well done unless it is the truth. What you believe, you do, what you do, you are!

In the same tenor Dr. Slosson says, "There has got to be some hard thinking done by those at the head of the Church during the next twenty years. Somebody has got to seize hold of the new conceptions and point out their moral applications. Otherwise somebody else will make immoral applications of them. . . . Eloquence of tongue and charm of manner will not compensate for want of thought. In time, any congregation will tire of a diet exclusively of boneless sermons stewed in cream."

Every religious leader in history has been a great theologian, often he has been a great liberator, moving onward in a changing world. Paul was the first and the greatest of them all. He had his limitations, but he made Christianity a world religion. About 200 A.D. came Clement of Alexandria who was as modern as a Modernist. His "Stromata" bridged the thought of two worlds, that of Christian ethics and Greek culture; and by his ideas of deity as the indwelling spirit in the heart, of love and justice as one rather than two aspects of

divinity, of God's constant plan of working up all things to what is better, and of character as the test of religion, he became the most persuasive theological power in the beginnings of that civilization.

Two hundred years later Augustine arose to make a new period and a firmer contribution to Europe. The West was inclined to law. He was an institutionalist, a believer in organization. He declared that one who had not the Church for his Mother could not have God for his Father. Thus arose the sacramental system that still haunts Christendom, and makes the chief office of the Church redemptive. The Church in Rome was born of Augustine's theology. For eight hundred years this system was unchallenged and supreme. It carried the religion of Christ through the Chaos. It probably saved Western civilization. But it was not enough. Times change. Another man, again a theologian, came with the golden thirteenth century and its new culture and invention. He saved (as the modern-bound theologian is not saving) the Church from a disastrous collision with the new knowledge. This was the Angelic Doctor, Thomas Aquinas, who gave the

Church that marvelous system, "Summa Theologiæ," a monumental intellectual attempt to put the Church in harmony with the new day. His book was, in fact, the Christianity of the closing years of the Middle Ages. After him another theological builder, a doctor of letters, appeared upon the scene,—Dante Alighieri with "The Divine Comedy." By his poetic and dramatic magnificence he moderated the meaning of the Church, and gave religion its august and terrific reality; he held loyal the cultivated people who otherwise might have departed from the faith. Theology needed a literary interpreter, as it always does; but it was still theology, as every spiritual poem and hymn, every sermon and prayer, because it contains a religious idea, is theology.

Still was there need for translating doctrine into the people's language, and Thomas à Kempis wrote the "Imitation of Christ," a book of mystic piety which next to the Bible has had the largest sale of any book in the world. He added the idea, partly clouded, that religion is personal and experimental, that people are hungry of heart, and will not be satisfied with doctrine whence all the warm blood of life has been let. His humanizing of

religious ideas with emotion stirred in the soul of the people just before the sixteenth century, and without this lovely spiritual theology of the simple folk, we should not have had the Reformation. Yet, again, the mystic of himself is not enough, for he loses the sense of history and his part in the continuity, and is prone to vagary. So one like John Wycliffe was due. He arrived with his definite historic contribution of the Bible, translated into English, which assumed now, instead of the varied beliefs of the time, first place in unifying spiritual authority. This theological position marked the period preceding the Reformation. The Bible was soon misjudged, misused, and became a fetish. Luther, like a thundering avalanche of spiritual wrath, a torrential storm of new doctrine, swept upon the world and said man's conscience and not a Book was the arbiter of truth. Here was sown the seed of individualism. The antithesis of Augustine's institutionalism was established. This doctrine made the great division. It separated Catholic from Protestant.

But John Calvin, the greatest theologian of them all except Paul and Aquinas, saw that Luther was revolutionary, and by a marvel-

ously systematic argument in his "Institutes," the supremacy of the Bible as authority was established, and the world saved from convulsion,—with Luther's acquiescence, it may be added, when he saw what he had done! And even to this day Calvin continues not only in his Presbyterian children, but in all the heirs of Protestantism, because he was a theologian extraordinary. He is, indeed, the historic father of Fundamentalism, for the one belief, straight from his book to Tennessee's law, is the divine infallibility of the Bible.

Theology in the later story of religion need not here be told, for the last great theologian, so far as prevailing power is concerned, was Calvin.

Some people will be incredulous, and deny such power to-day, but they will do well to remember that most of us are like Indians on a reservation. We think our world is the whole world, our little circle the rim of the universe. "There is a world elsewhere," said Coriolanus.

If one believes that a better time is coming, let the optimism be tempered by the realities.

It is right that we expect ministers to give the people a liberating theology. We pay enough for their training, heaven knows.

There is no profession which equals the high cost of theological education. Dr. Robert L. Kelly is authority (none better in the whole country) for the following figures: The average yearly cost per student in the colleges and professional schools is $466. The theological seminaries range as high each year as $5,000 per capita, many of them pay out in excess of $1,000, and a considerable number over $2,000.* And what do we get? Dr. Kelly says many of the seminaries could not qualify as educational institutions since they "neither speak the language nor use the methods of modern education." What kind of fellows become ministers? In a rhapsody about his former Methodist brethren, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman said, "If they do not shine as orators, they do shine as thinkers, which is more important." Certain figures came from the eminent editor of Methodism, Dr. Lewis Oliver Hartman of the redoubtable *Zion's Herald.* He studied the facts.

> Of the 444 men admitted in 1926, to the Methodist ministry [he said], 9 per cent. had only eighth-grade training or less; 16

* See "Theological Education in America," by Robert L. Kelly, LL.D. Doran, N. Y.

per cent. had part of a high-school course; 11 per cent. had only completed high school; 23 per cent. had at least a year of college work; 41 per cent. had graduated from college. Of these 183 college graduates, 36 did some postgraduate work (not in seminary), and 14 of the 36 won master's degrees in arts or sciences.

With reference to colleges attended: 64 per cent. were graduates or had attended college one year or more. Of these, only 51.6 per cent. went to Methodist Episcopal colleges; 17.2 per cent. went to denominational colleges other than our own; 10.1 per cent. went to State institutions of higher learning; 7.4 per cent. went to non-denominational schools other than State institutions (e.g., Columbia, Harvard); 9.5 per cent. went to two or more colleges of different types; 4.2 per cent., of foreign birth, were educated outside the United States. The foregoing refers to schools where undergraduate work was done.

The report shows that 52 per cent. had no theological training; 21 per cent. had a year or more in seminary, but did not graduate; 27 per cent. graduated from a seminary. Of the 122 who graduated, 102—or 23 per cent. out of 444—received a degree in theology.

Shining thinkers, indeed! That finding would make a fair cross-section of Pan-Protestantism. Some churches, like the Presbyterian, are higher in requirements, others, like the Baptists, are lower. Does any other profession tolerate such inadequate and uneven discipline? Obviously, when these men do have a theology, it is fundamentalist on all points. They do nothing for freedom. Only the best modern equipment in theology will make liberators. The conceptions of religion that prevail in actual preaching are what one might expect. They violate every canon of intelligence, every law of spiritual integrity. For example, at the 1927 Northern Baptist Convention, Dr. Jasper C. Massee, the original Fundamentalist who enjoys denominational preferment almost above any other man, delivered the Convention sermon, a discourse on the atonement that for outrageous grotesquerie of God, for shameless theological immorality against man, defies description and proper condemnation. Yet it was hailed with rapture and published in full in the Baptists' best paper, the *Watchman-Examiner*. Though grossly stated, it is not only the Baptist but the Protestant theology on the atone-

ment. That such a monstrosity could be spoken, A.D. 1927, is incredible to emancipated minds. It must be seen (in part) to be believed. The incident referred to was a bit of childhood mischief, of no serious consequence.

Now, my mother had one bad habit [said Dr. Massee]: she could be in the most unexpected places at the most undesirable times of any one I have known. I suddenly heard the swish of skirts, and looked up to find her standing in the doorway, her usually beautiful sunny face overcast with a cloud as black as midnight. The lightning was flashing from her eyes, and I suspected that the hand which she held behind her contained a thunderbolt ready to be hurled in my direction.

In great terror I buried my face in my arm and waited for the blow to fall. But just at that moment there was a rush of another pair of feet. My brother, just twenty-one years old and therefore "free from the law, oh, happy condition," passing through the side yard had glanced into the window and had taken in the full significance of that tableau. Loving the little lad as he loved nothing else, he ran up the side porch, opened the side door of that guest chamber,

and running across the room, threw his great 200-pound body down over the boy, thus completely covering him. Then he said:

"Lay on, mother! I will take it for him."

That was the sweetest music I have ever heard. He had covered my sin in covering the sinner!

I waited for a breathless second, and then peeped out from under his great body to see the cloud disappear from my mother's face, and the sunlight of tremulous joy and loving reconciliation upon her face. With tremulous lips she said:

"Get up from there, you rascal, and take him away, before I whip you both!"

So my brother rolled out on the safe side of the bed, lifted me up on his shoulders, carried me down to the gate where his great steed, ready saddled, was waiting. Lifting me into the saddle beside him we rode away for a busy day in the fields—a little boy safe with his elder brother.

There was another day when I found myself in the one place where God said I must not be. I looked into his face, black with his wrath against sin, and saw the sword of his justice unsheathed, and bowed my head before the stroke which was my due.

And then Jesus, my Elder Brother, interposed his body there on the cross between God and me. The stroke which was my due fell upon him. He was wounded for my transgression. He was bruised for my iniquities. The chastisement of my peace was upon him. With his stripes I was healed. In him I became the righteousness of God. He covered me. He covered my sin.

What gloating is this at sinning, escaping, and letting another take the rod! And of such is the Protestant religion.

Charles W. Eliot once said, "The creeds of the churches contain conceptions of God's nature and of his action toward the human race which are intolerable to the ethical mind of the twentieth century. . . . The conception of one being—human or divine—suffering, though innocent, for the sins of others, is revolting to the universal sense of justice and fair dealing." As though he had heard Dr. Massee's sermon, Dr. Eliot concluded as follows: "No school, no family, no court, would punish the innocent when the guilty were known. . . . This conception of God is hideous, cruel, insane, and no Christian church

which tolerates it can be efficient in the promotion of human welfare and happiness."

And the tragedy is that if any man dared to break from this doctrine, and others like it, the Church would rend him limb from limb and cast him out, as the Lutherans have done as this is written, in the case of one of their most successful and devoted ministers in the city of Pittsburgh. In every creedal Church the judgment against a brave soul would be swift and terrible, a warning that there shall be no freedom in the quest of truth. Still must it be said that the progress of religion comes by those heroic ones who hazard their lives in all ages of the Church, that freedom in theology may abound.

Theology! Religion! Both go together, interdependent. There is no conflict between them. They walk hand in hand. If it is true of the evil kind, of the good kind it is also true. Religion is yearning for Perfection, and theology is the intellectual expression of the yearning. A learned rabbi of our time, Dr. Nathan Krass, understands. A great congregation heard him say, "Without theology, religious man would walk in darkness. The great conflict arises when an antiquated theology is

preached as a finality. Each age must develop its own theology, linking the old faith with the new learning. Man needs not a new religion, but a theology which shall meet the challenge of science and philosophy. A true religion is not one that discards theology, but one which makes it expressive of the mind's fearless findings. God remains eternal and immutable. So speaks faith. Man's concept of God changes with the process of the suns. So speaks theology. A constant religion and a progressive theology will make for a finer humanity."

XI

FREEDOM BY CONSENT OF THE MAJORITY

OF Louis Pasteur men said when he died that he had done more for France than forty millions of his compatriots. History is as much the biography of great men as it is the chronicle of the lives of peoples. In the Great War, one person interpreted the principle that was the stake of the whole world. Woodrow Wilson spoke to mankind, and the spiritual might of democracy was made alive. As much as any other statesman of his time, Thomas Jefferson, with a theological affirmation, helped to create America. After he had written the Declaration of Independence, he took his place in the Virginia House of Delegates to plead successfully for religious toleration. He made an address that for trenchancy and puissance, in a precarious situation among very human men, is unsurpassed by any other of his utterances.

Jefferson said,—

"Whereas Almighty God hath created
the mind free, . . ."

Then follows,—"all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens" tend only "to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness," and are "a departure from the Holy Author of our religion, who being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either. . . ."

That, we all say, is fine. Invoking the sanction of Deity upon the principle of liberty was indeed the most religious sentiment in the founding of the Republic; but, unfortunately, men live also in a practical world, where ideals must be translated from the abstract to the working requirements of government. Jefferson understood that. As a matter of fact, he had already provided for it, practiced politician as he was, in the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," says that instrument, which is so sacred it is not always carefully examined, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty,

and the pursuit of Happiness." Then follows the important practical application,—

"That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*"

The meaning of these last ten words (which we have italicized) is commonly overlooked, but they may be so used as to nullify the ideal of freedom which they sought to preserve.

What is meant by "consent of the governed"? If Jefferson said that God created the mind free, is that not enough? No. In actual administration, God—it is said reverently—has, in effect, to be ratified by the consent of the governed! That is the reality. How is the consent determined? By vote. There is no other way. The majority rules. In Tennessee, where for the first time the test was made, William Jennings Bryan knew he had the lawful right. He said, "When the people speak with emphasis, they [the teachers in the public schools] will be glad to teach anything the people want." The people's "consent," for weal or woe, is the law.

Coercion, said Jefferson, God Almighty would not deign to employ; but the Fundamentalists may obtain the same results by out-

lawing certain teachings if popular sentiment demands it. At last, is there any difference between coercion and outlawry? Few will dispute Gerald Birney Smith of the University of Chicago, who says, "An appeal to authority is an appeal to force. If a person will not voluntarily yield, he must be *made* to yield. . . . There are those of us who believe that the last word of Christian devotion is love rather than legal coercion. The most painful thing about the attitude of authoritarian zealots is their conspicuous lack of Christian love."

It is well in this place for one to raise a question. Should love have priority in human conduct? Or should it, indeed, have superiority over truth or what men believe is truth? There is much to say for the loyalty to conviction which characterizes the mind of those who have been coercive, though they violate the spirit of tolerance. Moral passion is as necessary as truth. The question is, What shall men be ardent for? The America we associate with Jefferson and the other Fathers is, above all things, reasonable and open-minded. By no other way can progress come. Said Froude the historian, "If medicine had been regulated three hundred years ago by

Act of Parliament; if there had been Thirty-nine Articles of Physic, and every licensed practitioner had been compelled, under pains and penalties, to compound his drugs by the prescriptions of Henry the Eighth's physician, Dr. Butts, it is easy to conjecture in what state of health the people of this country would be at the present time." Transfer that reasoning, as Professor Smith has done, to the subject of evolution,—which we thought Henry Drummond had spiritualized and Christianized forty years ago in "The Ascent of Man,"—and it means that the theological opponents of evolution like their forerunners of old who fought the Copernican theory, have "deprived *religion* of the opportunity to prove that it prized truth-seeking more than dogmatic compulsion."

Christianity has been so creatively vital in the past as to make "such modifications in traditional doctrines and practices as were necessary in order to continue to be a vital force in the ever enlarging knowledge of man." But religion now seems an enemy of both education and liberty. Men are asking seriously, Can the American tradition and sentiment survive? To what will the majority consent? No one conceived it possible ten years ago

that the teaching of evolution would be made a crime. The facts to justify assurance seemed so plain and self-evident they may be set down in a few sentences.

First, the Bible is a religious book having no authority in any of its teaching except in the administration of the Churches which accept it as their rule of faith and practice.

Second, the Bible cannot justly be made the law of the country or of any State, because such a sectarian authority would be equivalent to an established sectarian Church, which is contrary to the Constitution. Certain grouped Protestants have no more right to make the Bible binding authority for all citizens than Roman Catholics have a right to make the Pope binding authority for all citizens.

Third, the teaching of evolution in the public schools is not a religious but a scientific function, belonging to the field of biology and not theology, and approved by the leaders of science in all parts of the world. Both theism and the religion of Jesus are espoused by thoroughgoing and reverent evolutionists, as Robert A. Millikan shows in "Science and Life," in a catalogue of the most distinguished scientists in America and England, who declare there is no conflict between science and

religion and prove it by their membership and activity in various Churches.

Fourth, the liberty of the soul and the spirit of free inquiry are the very breath of life in a democracy, and to take them away would be to stifle religion, smother the soul, and end the growth of learning and the progress of civilization.

Fifth, freedom is the natural and inalienable right of all men to believe what they will. To define their freedom is to limit it, and to limit freedom is to destroy it. We cannot be half under sectarian authority and half free, just as we could not endure, as Lincoln said, half slave and half free.

To these propositions there is a simple and telling rejoinder by the earnest and dogmatic-minded believer. He puts it in a syllogism and makes the application.

Christianity believes in God;
Evolution is godless;
Therefore, Evolution is contrary to Christianity.

Since this is a Christian nation, there must be no teaching of Evolution in the public schools.

When President Edgar Young Mullins went before the Legislature in Kentucky to take his stand for the Bill against evolution, he made a tremendous impression by a single sentence,—

"I do not believe that the Church shall have the power to say what shall and shall not be taught in the public school, and, on the other hand, I do not believe that the State shall have the power to teach something that is a direct attack on the Christian religion."

It will be replied that there is no enmity against religion in the teaching of science, and that evolution is not godless. But if fervent orators defend the faith and the souls of the multitudinous people from everlasting damnation by their attack on science and freedom, as the Churches teach, it is no matter to be dealt with jocularly by the remotely erudite and superior of the population. Religious consecration demands respect, even though it may be seized upon by demagogues to stampede the credulous into militant fanaticism. These people believe what they are *led* to believe. They are not to be blamed for thinking this country was founded on *their* kind of Christian dogmas. Did not a most learned

Justice of the United States Supreme Court once declare in a book that this is a Christian nation? Coming from one as near infallibility as American mortals may be it was believed as though it were true. Not the religion of Jesus, mark you, but one kind of Christianity! In an historic and legal sense it is true,—that *their* Christianity, namely the creedal Protestant religion whose master dogma is Bible infallibility, from whence comes the anti-evolution law, has never been seriously questioned. Disabilities and indignities have been heaped upon those of the citizenry who have not been of the elect faith, but creedal Protestants have always been favored.

One may read according to William Seagle that when the Constitution of the United States was submitted for ratification to the several States there was a hue and cry in the streets of Boston that religion had been abolished. The ratifying conventions in New Hampshire, New York, Virginia, and North Carolina refused to approve the Constitution till their fears of atheism, on the one hand, and Popery, on the other hand, were allayed. In Maryland a general tax for the support of the Christian religion was provided for, but no

citizen other than an avowed Christian could hold office up to 1851. Tithes for Protestant Christianity were not abolished in President Coolidge's State, Vermont, till 1808, and in Connecticut only Christian denominations were guaranteed powers, rights, and privileges by the constitution of 1818. New Hampshire provided for the support of "public Protestant ministers"; and in explicit terms Massachusetts followed New Hampshire's example.

In Pennsylvania there is a decision of the State Supreme Court which says, "The declaration that Christianity is part of the law of the land, is a summary description of an existing and very obvious condition of our institutions. . . . It is involved in our social nature that even those among us who reject Christianity, cannot get clear of its influence, or reject those sentiments, customs, and principles which it has spread among the people, so that, like the air we breathe, they have become the common stock of the whole country, and essential elements of its life." Chancellor Kent of New York declared in a leading case that the constitution of the State "did not prohibit the courts or the Legislature from regarding the Christian religion as the religion of the

people as distinguished from the *false religions of the world.*" A solid background of Protestantism is an historic fact, and the present manifestation of the Fundamentalist movement against religious liberty, though it assumes a new and more virulent form, is in fact but a resurgence of a spirit that we have had from the foundation of this country.

How truly the story runs! *"The consent of the governed"* has been invoked to determine the law. To consent! That means a voluntary, spiritual attitude. It is the business of religion to lead people to feel together, to agree, to consent. It fits into this conception with nicety that the World Christian Fundamentals Association decided in 1927 henceforth to build a legislative program that will cover the country. A new proposition is given officially by Dr. W. B. Riley, President. "Evolution is in fact not a science," he declares. "It is a religion or an irreligion. It is the religion of atheism. We are going to advise the passage of a uniform bill that will be based on the claim that State supported schools have no right to teach a philosophy that is unproven and is objectionable to *a great majority of the patrons of these institutions.* [Our italics.]

We plan to take three or four States a year and concentrate our forces there. Our program will be thorough, and will include New York, Pennsylvania, and other large States."

If the organized forces of Fundamentalism continue to go to the Legislatures to fight for their faith, which is subversive of liberty, are not the Modernists the proper ones to defend the rights of man as laid down in the religion of Jesus and the soul of the Nation? They cannot use the law, of course; also, they must flee the puerile notion that they accomplish any good whatever by merely herding together in so-called federations. Gregariousness is primarily animal, not spiritual. The times demand men with creative ideas. These do not come from people massed together. The growth in recent years of these federations of Churches, local, state and national, is in large part a corporate confession that the business of religious liberation is abandoned. Coöperation in ecclesiastical social service has become, in consequence, an emotional release for frustrated Protestants. It is a good and necessary work, but it is not the Church's distinctive calling, as nobody will deny. The Churches have been brought to a status hardly

higher in spiritual value than that of a Chamber of Commerce. It is a relatively shallow traffic in things unessential, in which near-Modernists predominate. They make a multitudinous procession that patters down Main Street. Such getting together gets nowhere.

No great ideas come of federations, because if such bodies are to succeed, they must first be emasculated of all the virility and distinctive religious gifts which make men and a cause strong. They agree, do these federations, to be silent about all spiritual subjects that would make an issue among them, such as liberty, which is, as a matter of fact, the most deadly of all Christian topics.

If the Modernists would follow the example of the Fundamentalists, that is, organize and put on a religious program, they might bring in a new Reformation. *That* would be something. Love of mankind—with an idea! All people want to see a reunited Christendom; but intelligent people know there are conditions that must first be met. There can be no union of bond and free. That is the major obstacle. Religion must not be chiefly a federation *against* social ills, but a mighty power *for* spiritual emancipation.

When the weightier matter of the law of liberty gets into the heart of Protestantism, all things will follow. The world has had a witness. America, under the spiritual guidance of its President in 1917, went into the Great War. The object was not earthly power, greater markets, increased lands, nor even fellowship. The object was impersonal and spiritual. It was Jefferson's theory of freedom extended to the universe,—"to make the world safe for democracy." The victory, because it was a spiritual victory, is shared today as much by the foes of the field as by the victors, for that is the impartial and sublime way of all things spiritual. The fruits of the Spirit are complete. Five things were won. They were partly old and partly new. They made the thinking and conviction of men different from what they were in 1914, throughout the world.

First, we believe that people the world around are prior to and greater than governments; that people are the creators and govments the creations; that Kings and Emperors and Presidents and all rulers get their authority from the people.

Second, we reaffirm the equality of all men

in rights and opportunities. Small nations stand on a level with large nations in their freedom to determine their own destiny. Czechoslovakia is one with Great Britain before the conscience of mankind, as Rhode Island is one with New York.

Third, we declare for the first time in history that nations must reorganize their relations with one another not on a basis of suspicion leading to war, but on a basis of mutual trust seeking peace. War is sin, a cursed thing which must die by freemen's hands.

Fourth, in the field of daily labor, a man is a man; one is not master and the other servant. Call the status what one will,—industrial democracy, shop committees, or co-partnership with employees,—the economic and the moral law alike dictate the imperative doctrine that men at their tasks (as in the Churches) are brethren.

Fifth, and crowning all of it, is the new birth of democracy, which is the earnest application of the principle called Christian to every relation of humankind,—from that of the mistress with her houseworker to the Powers standing in acknowledgment of the aspirations

of the Chinese to independence in their own 1776!

Wherever democracy to-day is denied and kept under, the new conscience in the world is quick against the violation of right. There is danger. The five great achievements that made an epoch in history are in jeopardy. They were won by the consent of the governed imbued with the idea that the mind was created free. They may be lost by the will of the majority determined to have its way without ruth.

In over-trustful minds freedom is regarded as an inviolable, indestructible gift. People believe that this priceless sentiment which was once conceived by a few dominant personalities and accepted by the majority is its own eternal invincible defense. But do they remember that the aspiration for freedom and the confidence in the consent of the governed came into our institutions at a time when the soul of the new-born republic was enthusiastic over its liberation? The old order of kings had been put off. All things became new. Only once in history since that day has there been such popular rejoicing. After the Great War the world was again "young for liberty."

What exaltation of spirit! But now, in the country which has gloried above many others that it is free, something has happened. Are we growing old and hard? Coercions and punishments and repressions are all about, and in some parts, that which was counted a changeless possession is repudiated.

To preserve freedom! As it was in the beginning, so must it be always. Jefferson got his basic theory of human brotherhood from Jesus. He gathered the Great Teacher's central lessons into what is known as "Jefferson's Bible." Woodrow Wilson was a son of the manse, born of the Scottish Covenanter stock that would not tolerate authoritarian bishops or tyrannous kings. What of an intolerant majority? A gospel will save us. Truth crushed to earth will rise again when we take it up stoutly, put it on its feet, and push it forward.

XII

A RELIGION FOR LIFE

IN the Song of Deborah there is a vivid and poignant strain in which she laments those unhappy days of her Hebrew people when "the highways were unoccupied and the travelers walked in the byways." This is an outward sign of an inward condition. Religion was no longer a major interest of the Nation, but a minor exercise in the private devotions of the pious souls who kept themselves aloof from the world. It was not enough. The Hebrews went down. There are many people who still choose to take their religion in a sequestered neighborhood chapel rather than in a cathedral on the thoroughfare, and who protest that spiritual things have nothing to do with politics or any of the larger problems of life. Religion is personal, they say. They do not see that there are no bounds to the effect of religion; nor that the attempt to limit piety to one's personal welfare and to neglect social

conditions all about, will soon or late bring disaster.

Charles Spurgeon was a genius among preachers. So great was the press to hear him, people were often in danger of their lives. What did he preach? It was that which is called the *simple* Gospel. It was the religion of the byways. It was minor Christianity. He searched the people's hearts and tried their souls, and no doubt made them good according to the canons of personal morality. That is a great ministry. To fail to keep the least of the commandments is, as Jesus taught, to violate the greatest of them. But it is not true that to observe the laws of personal goodness alone is to fulfill the purposes of religion. There is also a *complex* Gospel. It is required that one possess not only purity of heart but wisdom of mind for the difficult business of living in a universe. Sometimes the Gospel of bad news is as much needed as the Gospel of good news. While Spurgeon was preaching to his multitudes, evil forces were moving in the nations of the world to which he rarely if ever alluded, forces which, because they were unresisted by the Church, led straight to the horrendous cataclysm of 1914! The only so-

cial expression of religion that remains for a memorial to Spurgeon is an orphanage that bears his name; and on the battle-fields of Flanders in a single hour more orphans were made than that institution could care for in one hundred years. The highways are full of evil and the religion of the byways is inadequate to take care of it.

Yet it were folly to disregard the intimate, purifying, and healing services of the Church. Some men consider life in such large terms they forget that, after all, religion is made for man. "Under all the mutations of life and variations of culture," says Harris E. Kirk, "he remains just man." There is more than learning in this world, and more than politics. It is still true, as Friedrich Paulsen once said, "Whatever temple science may build there will always need to be hard by a Gothic chapel for wounded souls." Here is Louis Untermeyer, noted poet, whose son in college took his life. What has religion to say in the valley of the shadow? For the father it is mute. Sad is his state. "All of us—ministers and all—don't know what the reason for life is," he writes. "And so, not understanding life, some of us say let's end it." Mr. Untermeyer makes a

grievous assertion: "We are almost unfitted for religion in the old sense—we are scientific." He speaks of his own Judaism as well as of Christianity. He offers what seems an amazing substitute: "What we want in place of the religious faith is a faith in life itself." Unwittingly, Mr. Untermeyer has stated two great affirmations in apparent denials. Faith in life is in fact the last and highest of all faiths in the liberated churches. This faith *is* religion. To know the meaning of life is religion's supreme task. It is loyalty to life that moves in all the great spiritual thought of the age. That is why brotherhood is so precious.

When Cardinal Mercier, Roman Catholic hero of Belgium, went before the Protestant Episcopal General Convention in Detroit, during his visit to this country after the war, did he speak of differences between the two great divisions of Christendom? In no wise. His closing remarks were: "I ask to be allowed to add one word more, and that is that we are brothers in Christian faith. What we must know and teach is that if we are brethren it is because we are all sons of the Father who is in heaven." Brotherhood is life. Such a belief

first converted Wilfred Grenfell the student and then led him to the bleak shores of Labrador where he, too, became a great physician. He goes in and out among the fisher-folk and finds among them such kindness as only pure religion could create and sustain. They also seek life and save it. He tells a story of a poor fisherman who had taken him across a bay to see a dying man. "He apologized when at last I got to his house cold and wet," says Grenfell, "because the hot tea that he offered me had neither sugar nor milk. There were several children in the room, partly grown up, and miserably clad. In the attic I found an old fisherman dying of cancer of the throat and his old wife, blind with cataract, crooning from her broken heart over the partner of her life. After doing what I could, I came down the ladder that served for the stairs, and asked my friend whether this was his father. 'Only a neighbor,' he replied. 'How long has he been in your house,' I asked. He replied that the man had been there about a year. I said: 'Do they pay anything for their food?' 'They have nothing to pay.' I then asked him: 'Why do you do it, seeing that you and your children

are so much in need?' The man looked into my face and said the same thing: 'What would *you* do, doctor?' "

What, indeed, would any one do who has the instinct for life and the bond of it, the healing of it, which, after all, is the deepest note in religion?

Once there was a different strain in religion which made God deal cruelly with man, and the least wrongdoing was enough to cause the wrongdoer to be regarded as an outcast and to be severely punished. To-day theology keeps life as the key, and it bends its whole soul to reinstate offenders. It is not interested in "satisfying" a so-called divine justice but with all its might seeks the social adjustment of the individual so that he may be a happy and serviceable member of society. Life is the end. It is no less true when one is innocent of offense, and is the victim of a system which breaks the spirit. Bishop Francis J. McConnell went, during the steel strike following the Great War, to see a worker in McKeesport, Pa.

"Why are you striking?" inquired the Bishop. "Is it for more money?"

"No, I don't complain of my wages."

"Is it because you want the mills unionized?"

"Not primarily."

"Well, then, why are you striking?"

And the man said, "I am striking against the twelve-hour day. The fact is this: Two months ago I stood by the bedside of a fourteen-year-old daughter. I saw her die, and a day or two later, one Sunday afternoon, I saw her buried. As I stood by that open grave, I suddenly remembered that I did not know that girl. I had never known her. My hours of work had been such that I came home after she had gone to bed, or I left home before she was around, and I saw her only occasionally. I have another daughter twelve years of age back at home, and the reason I am striking is this: *I am striking for a chance to get acquainted with my twelve-year-old daughter.*" Something holy was taken from his life, and he would not be comforted until it was restored to him.

Religion is constantly saying to men who follow after material ambition that fullness of life is not that way. When things are in the saddle, despair comes soon or late. In a poem, entitled "The Tragedy of Richard Cory,"—a

character who was the envy of the town,—Edward Arlington Robinson has written to rebuke this opulent civilization which so tragically misunderstands.

"And he was rich—yes, richer than a king—
And admirably schooled in every grace:
In fine, we thought that he was everything
To make us wish that we were in his place.

"So on we worked, and waited for the light,
And went without meat, and cursed the bread;
And Richard Cory, one calm summer night,
Went home and put a bullet through his head."

Faith in life itself! That is the report which comes back alike from the highways and the byways, from the followers of major and of minor religion. It is because liberty for the soul has been creative of life that in all ages the greatest leaders have loved liberty. In the free religion of Jesus is one of the greatest of all sayings, "I am come that ye might have life and have it more abundantly." That is every man's mission. There is no logic-chopping in the plea for freedom. It is the one indispen-

sable possession for individuals and for nations.

An impatient man once said that freedom is not an end in itself, that what one does with one's freedom is the only consideration. That is not true. Just to be free is a priceless boon. It makes for tranquillity and potential might, and in quiet as well as in action it is of inestimable worth. And even if it should be true that freedom of itself is nothing, it is certainly true that all else without freedom is nothing. When one is not free, one lives in soul-killing servitude, under some kind of master; but when one is free, one renders a service, wherever it may be, and enjoys the respect which goes with human dignity and equality.

For a generation there has been a steady development among religious thinkers of the principle that human life is supreme. It is a modern idea. Once theologians disregarded life, and merely mulled over their *a priori* theories. But for intelligent needs the old theology passed away before the teaching of such men as Lyman Abbott, David Swing and Washington Gladden, in the closing decade of the nineteenth century. These men had, in fact, been preceded by such leaders as

Theodore Parker, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and William Ellery Channing. The first move from the dogmatic order led the churchmen to the Bible where they hoped to find a better theology. But the results were not satisfactory because they fell to using the Bible to suit their sectarian needs. They went to the Scripture with their preconceptions and found what suited them. You can prove anything from the Bible! It was also learned that in a living world no book can contain all human experience. The theologians and preachers turned from the Bible to the philosophers, as G. B. Smith tells us in a review of theology, and actual human experience took the place of proof-texts and dogmatic theories, as a basis for finding out what religion really is.

But here again, the doctors soon talked of a peculiar kind of experience, which they said Jesus once had, and no other at all had it in the world. And none could have it except through him. His personality was unique. This idea came from a German named Ritschl. It marked a transition from the dogmatic theories of Christianity to the more empirical and historical conception of religion. It came closer to life. But men asked, is there such a

thing as a unique experience of a unique personality? They are blunt, and do not care in the least what happens to any system of theology. They want the truth. They demand the meaning of religion. They will not piously read into the Bible or any other words meanings that are not there. For instance, when men speak of "the mind of Christ," it is not enough. What is that mind? When religion is called "a way of life," as though that settled it, they say, "*Which* way?" Most of the ideas about Jesus are the notions of the people who write or speak about him rather than the truth itself. Is the Jesus of Bruce Barton the real Jesus, or is he a super-Rotarian conceived in the mind of the author? Is Mary Austin's small-town person the authentic presentment? Or what of Rabbi Klausner's Judaized Oriental teacher? One may go through the endless catalogue of books on Jesus and come to one conclusion: The book which pleases one best is probably the book which idealizes one's own character and quality. That is not a safe critical guide for the progress of religion.

In theology the final appeal is to experience, and the method is to find the facts and put

them precisely as a scholar does in any field of study. William James began an epoch when he followed this way in his book, "The Varieties of Religious Experience." The change marked a liberative revolution. In all of this astounding progress among the doctors of theology (would that it might extend its influence over the darkened churches!) we have but a confirmation of what many people have been seeking in actual life. Is it not this thing which Mr. Untermeyer, and Dr. Grenfell, and Bishop McConnell's steel-worker longed for? Life! Life is the arbiter, the source of all wisdom, the goal of all striving. What makes life is religion.

Only yesterday George A. Coe, distinguished and devout Christian and leader in this country in the psychology of religion, made a study directly from life of the religion of students. They were gathered in a conference. He went about his task with no more sentimentality than a biologist working over a microscope on plant cells or animal tissue. His reverence for truth equalled his reverence for the young men and women. He found after analysis four kinds of religion presented to the youth by prominent ministers. The con-

trast, Dr. Coe says, "between the sessions that had vim and those that had not," is itself the best comment on what religion meant to these alert young people.

First, there was what he called *miracle-religion.* Glenn Clark, with his unusual ideas of prayer, represented this type. Its characteristic method is to stress the extraordinary in religious experience and to attempt to show that it may become ordinary experience. But the students, while curious, were not seriously impressed with this type. It lacked normality and scientific appeal for them. The second kind, called *modernist-evangelicalism,* is represented by such men as Fosdick, Coffin, and C. W. Gilkey. It accepts up to a certain point the results of modern knowledge in reference to the Bible, but it looks for the regeneration of the individual and society in a past rather than a present revelation of God. This type may also be called near-liberal. One who is familiar with its spokesmen observes that it looks both ways, backward and forward. It is divided, half under authority and half free; it straddles, is muddled, and goes round and round. It was unsatisfying to the requirements of the students, for when it is pressed

too hard, it passes over into *miracle-religion.*

Of the third kind, *sentimental-mysticism,* the students would have none. It had for its prophet the famous Anglican, Studdert Kennedy, famous in the War as Chaplain "Woodbine Willie." By taking the climactic episodes associated with the theological Christ, such as the crucifixion and the resurrection, he induced spiritual effects by great dramatic and imaginative appeal. But because Dr. Kennedy disregarded the historic facts in the life of Jesus, he did not strongly appeal to the students. It was when the fourth kind of religion, *ethical-creativity,* was on the program, says Dr. Coe, that "religion was present in the full sense of the term." Here was the appeal to life, by such men as Reinhold Niebuhr and Kirby Page. There was no turning to the past, no binding authorities. We ourselves must prove the things of the spirit. Religion must be the original expression of our own life, used in the service of our own times and on our own terms. Creative and masterful, indeed! But is not this what the great leaders have always done? The men in the conference were not interested in saving the dogmas of an expiring Chris-

tianity. They desired a creative faith,—to make all things new. There was a trace of doubt about the excellence of even this kind of religion, because it may become mere ethical zeal rushing in to save the world, instead of creative power enabling men to understand the problems personal, industrial, military, national and international. Bustling cannot take the place of thought. Actions have value only as they are based on sound ideas. A religion must be first creative and then ethical. But the students showed what is the coming American religion. Their Gospel will not bring at once a new heaven and a new earth. It is not impatient. It has life on its side. It cannot lose.

Of the right attitude of religion to life, R. H. Tawney says it "may at once accept and criticize, tolerate and amend, welcome the gross world of human appetites as the squalid scaffolding from amid which the life of the spirit must rise, and insist that this also is material for the Kingdom of God. To such a temper all activities divorced from religion are brutal or dead, but none are too mean to be beneath or too great to be above it, since all, in their different degrees are touched with the

spirit that permeates the whole." By this word is Dr. Coe confirmed. There are, indeed, many voices in the world speaking in the same strain. Only to-day a creative teacher and prophet steps down from his honored pulpit, full of years and of wisdom. George A. Gordon has always borne witness to life. When he was a student, at Harvard University, he knew hard, hard days, and thought long, long thoughts. One morning he was deep in perplexity. He was sitting alone in Appleton Chapel, "weary with work, tired in every nerve." He says, "I asked myself this question: What is it all for, this toil and struggle, living in the heart of intellectual conflict, nothing sure, everything brought in question? What is the good of it? Then came this thought: Life stands at the center of the world, human life; whatever cleanses that, whatever redeems it from the power of evil, whatever gives it freedom, whatever greatens and glorifies it, must be true.

"Religion then appeared to me to mean sovereign insight into life's meaning, insight that generates power to overcome the world, the flesh and the devil, insight that brings one into humble but happy service in the kingdom

of God, that leads a man to consecrate his being to the improvement of the life of his kind, and gives him a song in the night and in the light."

To this end, life defends itself. In "the least of creeping things," there is "the instinct for life and for freedom of action." "Touch it, and in an instant it has gathered itself into a tiny ball around its vital parts." In a man life puts up a tremendous fight. The passionate protest of him against forces that would take his freedom away is a challenge for battle in which the issue is of life and death. When men no longer have the strong desire to be free, they have already begun to die. The stern note must be in religion, for "from morning till evening of his day" man must struggle for his freedom. It is a sacred fire which must be forever tended, if it is to continue to glow in the history of the people.

THE END

University of Southern California Library

Dieffenbach, Albert Charles, 1876-
Religious liberty; the great American illus
by Albert C.Dieffenbach. New York, W.Morrow
co., 1927.
xiii p., 1 l., 205p. 19 1/2cm.

228388